

## Nuptial Imagery in the Revelation of John(\*)

Examinations of the wedding metaphor in Rev are generally limited to Rev 19 and 21<sup>(1)</sup>. However, in addition to the announcement of the “wedding of the lamb” in Rev 19,6-9 and the presentation of celestial Jerusalem as a “bride” (Rev 21,2.9), the image of the wedding, often overlooked, has already appeared in the letters to the churches (Rev 2,10; 3,11) as well as in the middle section (14,4-5) and is encountered again in Rev 18,23 and 22,17. The comparison of the two female figures of the harlot and the bride in Rev 17–21 is thus embedded in contrasting declarations, making metaphoric use of gender, that appear throughout all of Rev as a continuous theme<sup>(2)</sup>. In the following paper, the nuptial images of Revelation will be examined upon the background of tradition in Judaic imagery, and, within this process, the integration of various elements of such imagery such as metaphors of meals, clothes, city and royalty will become visible. By contrasting the various images of harlotry and the wedding, one of the basic structural elements of Revelation can be recognized.

### I. The “wreath of life” (Rev 2,10; 3,11)

In two letters to the churches, the faithful Christian is promised a crown or a wreath (Rev 2,10; 3,11). The “wreath of life” (στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς) in Rev 2,10 is a formulation that has a parallel tradition in Jas 1,12 but remains without analogy in secular Greek literature. Generally, this metaphor is explained within the scope of the Pauline tradition of the victory wreath (1 Cor 9,24, compare Phil 3,14; 2 Tim

(\*) Paper read on the SBL International Meeting in July 2002 at Berlin (Germany).

<sup>(1)</sup> See for example J. FEKKES III, “The Bride has prepared herself”: Revelation 19–21 and Isaian Nuptial Imagery”, *JBL* 109 (1990) 269-287; K.E. MILLER, “The Nuptial Eschatology of Revelation 19–22”, *CBQ* 60 (1998) 301-318; B.J. MALINA, “How A Cosmic Lamb Marries: The Image of the Wedding of the Lamb (Rev 19:7ff.)”, *BThB* 28 (1999) 75-83; B.R. ROSSING, *The Choice between Two Cities: Whore, Bride, and Empire in the Apocalypse* (HTS 48; Harrisburg, PA 1999).

<sup>(2)</sup> On this see my study R. ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik und Gottesverhältnis*. Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie eines Bildfelds in Urchristentum und antiker Umwelt (WUNT II/122; Tübingen 2001) 387-488.

4,8), and this explanation is supported by the references of νικάω in the context of Rev 2–3 (cf. Rev 2,6–7.11.15; 3,5.12 etc.) as well as the athletic contests that are proven to have taken place in Smyrna, the addressee of one of the letters.

### 1. *The “wreath of life” as bridal wreath*

Alone the manifold uses of “wreathes/crowns” within Revelation itself<sup>(3)</sup> should lead one to be wary of one-sided models of explanation. The competition scenario clearly plays no role in Jas 1,12–15. Instead, fortitude and fidelity between man and woman are in the foreground. Lust (ἐπιθυμία) is portrayed as a seductive woman whereas a true love relationship exists only with God. The wreath of life could then mean the bridal wreath, which, in both Judaic and Hellenistic wedding rituals, has been documented for both the bride and the groom and can be understood as a symbol of (premarital) chastity<sup>(4)</sup>. Additionally in Rev 2,10, the semantic field πειρασμός is associated with the promise of the wreath of life, leading one to assume a common basis of tradition with Jas 1,12. In the same way in Rev 3,9–11, the wreath becomes the expression for fortitude in the face of temptation, which endangered the love of the narrator (Rev 3,9).

### 2. *Traditional background*

Metaphors of the crown/wreath can be found in several scriptures of Jewish tradition, often linked to Jerusalem or Zion. According to Lam 2,15, it is the virgin, daughter of Zion, who is named the “delight of the whole world” and “crown of beauty” (στέφανος δόξης). In Bar 5,1–2, Jerusalem should discard the cloak of mourning in order to place the “diadem of splendour of the eternal” on her head. A clear connection between the metaphor of the crown and the wedding can be found in Ezek 16 and Cant 3. In Ezek 16,12, the foundling is crowned with a beautiful crown while she is adorned as a bride (στέφανον

<sup>(3)</sup> See the crowns of the 24 Elders (Rev 4,4.10); the crowns of the grasshoppers (Rev 9,7), the crown of the son of man (Rev 14,14) or the astral crown of the pregnant woman (Rev 12,1). The New Testament further speaks of a “crown of righteousness” (2 Tim 4,8) or “crown of glory” (1 Pet 5,4).

<sup>(4)</sup> For the bridal wreath of the Judaic bridal pair see J. CONRAD, “כלה”, *ThWAT*, IV, 174–178; for the Greek tradition see M. BLECH, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen* (RVV 38; Berlin 1982) 75–81. Also my summary in ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 243–244 and 251.

καυχήσεως). The bride described in Ezek 16 is not only “worthy to reign” (Ezek 16,13), but, more to the point, she also serves as a metaphor for Jerusalem. Further, in Cant 3,11 the crown is associated with marriage as the lover is compared to King Solomon, who was crowned by his mother on the day of his wedding. Simultaneously, it is in Cant 3,11 that for the first time an allegorization of Cant in the Judaic tradition (JHWH-Israel) can be demonstrated (see m. Taan 4,8). A symbolically meaningful motif of the bridal wreath within a wedding can also be found in the intertestamental Jewish scripture JosAs. According to JosAs 18,5-6 Aseneth is described, demonstrated also by the royal girdle (JosAs 18,6), as a royal bride setting a golden wreath on her head. Simultaneously, with her adornment as a bride a transformation from mourning to great joy takes place. Thus, the bridal garland becomes, together with the bridal jewelry, a symbol of heavenly transformation, depicted and promised in the image of the wedding. The intertextual parallel to Rev becomes obvious here<sup>(5)</sup>.

Lastly, a passage in the intertestamental Jewish document *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB) should be referred to, for here the bridal wreath is mentioned in close connection to an upcoming death. Seila, the daughter of Jephta, laments her virginity, for, due to her father’s vow, she is to be sacrificed as a virgin:

I have not been satisfied on my bridal bed and was not granted the wreaths of my wedding (...). And over time the flowers of the wreath that my nurse has woven will wilt (LAB 49,6).

Although this scene can hardly be understood in a metaphorical sense, there appears here to be a certain parallel to a custom within the Greek wedding ritual which could be drawn upon as a donor field for the New Testament metaphor of the “wreath of life”. Portrayed upon a lutrophora in Athens there is a young dead girl whose death crown is marked with spiky leaves. This crown is the same as that which is otherwise used at weddings. Salis and, following him, Baus therefore assumed that it was customary in Greece to adorn a woman who died as a virgin with a bridal wreath<sup>(6)</sup>. It has been unquestionably

<sup>(5)</sup> In the same document, Joseph is also described as a bridegroom with a “golden crown” on his head, see JosAs 5,5 according to C. BURCHARD, *Joseph und Aseneth* (JSRZ II/4; Gütersloh 1983) 577-735, here 643.

<sup>(6)</sup> See A. v. SALIS, “Die Brautkrone”, *Rheinisches Museum* 78 (1920/24) 212-213; K. BAUS, *Der Kranz in Antike und Christentum. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Tertullians* (Theophaneia 2; Bonn <sup>2</sup>1965) 111.

substantiated that lutrophora, amphoras with which the water for a bridal bath was fetched, were placed on the graves of virgins. It is possible that it was also usual in a broader sense to adorn dead women as brides. In this way Kalirrhoe, who was believed to be dead, was made up as a bride (Charito I.6,2). Conversely, some Greek epitaphs expressly regret that the deceased could not be adorned as a bride<sup>(7)</sup>.

If the “wreath of life” in Rev is also used specifically as an image of hope against death (martyrdom), the formulation does not only have to be understandable within the image of the “martyr as athlete” but also retains its meaning within the scope of the wedding. This shows up not least in the later depiction of the martyr Blandina whose death, described in detail, is depicted as a wedding. Her death is union (κοινωνία) with Christ<sup>(8)</sup>.

As the crown/wreath was used only once in the Judaic tradition as a metaphor for competition (cf. 4 Macc 17,15), and the imagery of Rev is without a doubt dependent on the Old Testament Judaic traditions<sup>(9)</sup>, it seems likely that the image of the wreath of life in Rev 2,10 and 3,11 alludes to the *bridal wreath*. The use of such a metaphor falls back on an inner-Judaic tradition in which the crown/wreath was associated with feminine figures (wisdom, virtue, Jerusalem/Zion) and in which at times the bridal crown was directly mentioned (Ezek 16,12; Cant 3,11). The NT metaphor of the wreath (of life) connects the wreath in Rev, as in Jas 1,12, with statements about faithfulness, fortitude and love. Further, the wreath of life in the sense of the bridal crown is regarded in the later Christian tradition as a symbol of (sexual) restraint (John Chrysostom)<sup>(10)</sup>.

<sup>(7)</sup> See an epitaph from Asia Minor *JRS* 17 (1927) 51, n. 230; further *JRS* 18 (1928) 23 n. 234 (table 1), according to BAUS, *Kranz*, 112 n. 116.

<sup>(8)</sup> “So she ran through all the battles of her children and hurried after them, filled with joy and happiness, as if she had not been thrown to the animals, but rather invited to a wedding” (53-54); “as a consequence of her unification (κοινωνία) with Christ she could not feel “that a wild steer impaled her with its horns”, Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.3.4. Compare A. JENSEN, *Gottes selbstbewußte Töchter. Frauenemanzipation im frühen Christentum* (Freiburg i.Br. 1992) 195-196.

<sup>(9)</sup> As, for instance, J. FREY, “Die Bildersprache der Johannesapokalypse”, *ZThK* 98 (2001) 161-185, here: 170, as well as S. MOYISE, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (JSNTSS 115; Sheffield 1995); ID., “Does the author of Revelation misappropriate the Scripture”, *AUSS* 40 (2002), 3-21; G.K. BEALE, *John’s Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSS 166; Sheffield 1998).

<sup>(10)</sup> See J. Chrysostomus, *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 9,2 (PG 62,546). See also J. SCHRIJNEN, “La couronne nuptiale dans l’antiquité chrétienne”, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 309-319.



## II. The 144,000 as virginal bride (Rev 14,4-5)<sup>(11)</sup>

The 144,000, who appeared previously in Rev 7,4, are described in detail in Rev 14,4-5. The motifs brought together in Rev 14,4-5 are not lined up randomly but rather indicate definite metaphoric traditions that each in its own way sheds light on the controversial motif of virginity<sup>(12)</sup>. The expression “defilement with women” (μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν, v. 4) incorporates, as A. Yarbro Collins, K. Berger and lastly D.C. Olson<sup>(13)</sup> have already shown, a formulation from the early Judaic interpretation of the tradition of the fallen angels (Hen[gr] 5–15; Jub 5,1; Gig; etc.)<sup>(14)</sup> of Gen 6,1-4. Above all in the Book of the Watchers in 1 Enoch 1–36 there are several similar or even identical formulations:

They took for themselves wives from all whom they chose; and they began to cohabit with them and to defile themselves with them<sup>(15)</sup>.

Καὶ ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας· ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἐξελέξαντο ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας, καὶ ἤρξαντο εἰσπορεύεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὰς καὶ μιαινεσθαι ἐν αὐταῖς (Hen[gr] 7,1, cf. 9,8; 10,11; 15,2-7).

Assuming that the author of Rev takes up this tradition in his formulation, the expression ‘defile with women’ makes sense because the sons of God have, according to Gen 6,1-4, defiled themselves with the daughters of man, meaning women. According to Olson, the author of Rev described the chosen 144,000 as “good angels” in explicit contrast to the watchers and thus has emphasized the observance of angelic virginity (Hen[aeth] 15,7)<sup>(16)</sup>. However, while sexuality, for

<sup>(11)</sup> For detail on this subject see my article: R. ZIMMERMANN, “Die Virginitäts-Metapher in Rev 14,4-5 im Horizont von Befleckung, Loskauf und Erstlingsfrucht”, *NT* 45 (2003) 45-70.

<sup>(12)</sup> See also the overview by O. BÖCHER, *Die Johannesapokalypse* (EdF 41; Darmstadt 1998) 56-63.

<sup>(13)</sup> See A.Y. COLLINS, “Woman’s History and the Book of Revelation”, *SBLSP* 1987 (ed. K.H. RICHARDS; Atlanta 1987) 80-91; K. BERGER, “Enoch”, *RAC* 14 (1988) 473-545, here: 514-516; Id., *Theologiegeschichte des Neuen Testaments*. Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen 1995) 585; D.C. OLSON, “‘Those who have not defiled themselves with Women’: Revelation 14:4 and the Book of Enoch”, *CBQ* 59 (1997) 492-510.

<sup>(14)</sup> In the Book of Giants from Qumran (1Q23; 1Q24; 4Q203; 4Q530-533; 6Q08). See L.T. STUCKENBRUCK, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*. Texts, translation, and commentary (TSAJ 63; Tübingen 1997).

<sup>(15)</sup> See the translation from M. BLACK, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. A New English Edition (SVTP 7; Leiden 1985).

<sup>(16)</sup> OLSON, “Revelation 14:4 and the Book of Enoch”, 501.

Enoch and a certain line of tradition, should be protologically and eschatologically evened out, the sexual dimension in Rev is spiritualized and is thus functionalized religiously<sup>(17)</sup>. Thus for Rev 14,4, virginity can not be equated with asexuality. Going further, however, it could be observed that the mythos of the fallen angels in intertestamental scriptures is employed above all for the metaphorical treatment of the problem of mixed marriage (compare Jub). Inadmissible sexual association, whether between angels and humans or between Jews and non-Jews, thus had to be rejected. As, previously in Rev 2,14.20, “fornication and food sacrificed to idols” incorporates a classical formulation from the ‘letter of the apostles’ (Acts 15,20.29 and 21,25)<sup>(18)</sup>, this theme could also have been taken up in Rev 14,4 and this time could be associated with a metaphoric expression from the mythos of the fallen angels. The further context also brings the talk of “virginity” into the scope the wedding. On one hand, “virginity” and “immaculateness” are the most basic elements of a bride in early Judaic time<sup>(19)</sup>. On the other hand, the motif of redemption is associated with the wedding. In this way, marital contracts from Muraba’at or from the Babatha Archive<sup>(20)</sup> as well as rabbinical texts<sup>(21)</sup> speak explicitly of the obligation to ransom a wife, should she be taken prisoner. Further, the reference to the 144,000 as δοῦλοι (Rev 7,3) leads to the assumption that this alludes to the custom, normal in Hellenistic times, of the purchase of a female slave for the purpose of

<sup>(17)</sup> The religious treatment of the difference of the sexes was completed by 1) the evening out of sexuality (Mk 12,25par.; Gal 3,28; EvThom # 22; 2 Clem 12,2) and 2) by the spiritualized unification of the sexes (Gen 2,24; 1Cor 6,16-17; Eph 5,30; 2 Clem 14; EvPhil), see ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 672.

<sup>(18)</sup> One assumes that “to commit fornication” was regarded as an equally concrete offence as the eating of food sacrificed to idols; a reference to the decree suggests itself also in the formulation “to impose a burden” (Rev 2,24) which occurs with the same terminology in Acts 15,28. See on this BERGER, *Theologieggeschichte*, 585-586.

<sup>(19)</sup> See Deut 22,13-21; Sir 7,24; Tob 3,14; Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 3,80; Josephus, *Ant.* 4,244.246-248; further b. Ket 46a; compare also G. SCHÖLLGEN, “Jungfräulichkeit”, *RAC* 19 (2001) 523-592; also in Eph 5,27 the immaculateness of the bride is emphasized, see m. Ket 7,7-8.

<sup>(20)</sup> See i.e. M 20 (Muraba’at): “If you are taken away as a prisoner, I will ransom you and bring you back to your homeland”, text according to K. BEYER, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten Talmudischen Zitaten* (Göttingen 1984) 309-310.

<sup>(21)</sup> See m. Ket 4,8 as special agreement to the marriage contract; further m. Ket 4,4; m. Hor 3,7; b. Ket 47b; 51b; 52a.b; t. Ket 4,5.

marriage<sup>(22)</sup>. It is even more probable that this is an allusion to the fact that, after the legal reforms of Augustus, being purchased for marriage was the only way for a female slave to attain freedom<sup>(23)</sup>.

In the final analysis, virginity, the promise of the 144,000 to follow, and the ransom of the first fruit incorporate linguistic forms characteristic of the Judaic tradition of imagery (Jer 2,2-4). The motifs of following after another and the first fruit demonstrate a close linguistic connection to Rev 14,4 (οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες οὐ ἀπαρχή). Further, there are unmistakable allusions in Jer 2,2-3 to the bridal ritual. The MT speaks explicitly of the love of the betrothal (לְאַהֲבָה בְּתוּלָה), and this semantic field is also present in the Greek translation ἀγάπης τελειώσεώς σου for the wedding was called τέλος in Greek. In addition, the sanctity alludes to the betrothal, for the betrothal was called "Qiddushin" (aram. קִדּוּשִׁין) in Hebrew as well as Aramaic. The betrothal formula was "You are sanctified to me" (b. Qid 5b). The undefilement and immaculateness of the 144,000 could be seen as an expression of this sanctity. As in the metaphoric tradition Israel is sanctified as a bride for JHWH<sup>(24)</sup>, so are the chosen ones sacred for God and the lamb, so that they are shifted into the scope of the celestial bride Jerusalem.

All interpretations come to be unified in the function of the chosen 144,000 being removed from the influence of foreign power and foreign claims to ownership. The metaphors of immaculateness and

<sup>(22)</sup> Based on the marital laws of Emperor Augustus, such as the *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* (On the Marriage among the Citizens, 18 B.C.) or the *Lex Iulia et Papia Poppaea* (4 B.C.) a real obligation to marriage, that promoted such actions, was proclaimed; on the marital laws of Augustus see A. METTE-DITTMANN, *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus. Eine Untersuchung im Rahmen der Gesellschaftspolitik des Princeps* (Historia 67; Stuttgart 1991) esp. 131-198.

<sup>(23)</sup> In the *Lex Aelia sentia* (4 A.D.) the release of a slave was permitted only after the age of 30 because conservative circles saw a political and social danger in *liberti* of the mass releases at the end of the Republic. On this see G. ALFÖDY, "Die Freilassung von Sklaven und die Struktur der Sklaverei in der römischen Kaiserzeit", *Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit* (ed. H. SCHNEIDER) (WdF 552; Darmstadt 1981) 336-371; A. WACKE, "Die Heirat freigelassener Frauen nach römischem Recht", *Die Braut: Geliebt, verkauft, getauscht, geraubt. Zur Rolle der Frau im Kulturvergleich* (ed. G. VÖLGER – K. v. WECK; Köln 1997) 246-257; for precise reasons see ZIMMERMANN, "Virginitäts-Metapher".

<sup>(24)</sup> In the rabbinical tradition there is a linguistic construction that follows from the interpretation of Cant 3,11b in m. Taan 4,8 (R. Gamaliel). This construction describes the granting of the Torah on Sinai as an engagement or wedding of JHWH to Israel. See ShemR 33,7; 41; DevR 3 zu Deut 31,9. The basis could have been the linguistic ambiguity in Exod 19,10: "Hallow them to me". On this see ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 310-311.

defilement have been employed in the early Christian tradition since Paul in connection with conflicts over authority. According to 2 Cor 11,2-3<sup>(25)</sup>, so-called “super-apostles” endanger the virginity of the communal bride through their incorrect teachings<sup>(26)</sup>. According to this linguistic construct, “virginity” stands precisely for the purity of teaching and the non-recognition of other authorities. In the context of Rev, this metaphoric tradition grants the expression “virginity” a deeper meaning, for the chosen ones are removed from the realm of power of the harlot. Further, the infrequent term μολύνω<sup>(27)</sup> (defile) in Rev 3,4 has already been employed in the context of purity and originality of teaching (Rev 3,3). Instead, the exclusive affiliation with the Lamb is emphasized and illustrated with images of the betrothal. The varying elements of the imagery of Rev 14,1-5, such as virginity, immaculateness, the promise of the 144,000 to follow and the ransom of the first-born, form a sub-section in the metaphor of the wedding. The 144,000 elected are described in images of the wedding, meaning that the vision in Rev 14,1-5 can be seen as a anticipation of the wedding of the lamb. This wedding is then developed further in Rev 19,6-9 and Rev 21,2.9.

### III. The voice of bridegroom and bride (Rev 18,23)

The author of Rev illustrates the fall of the city in Rev 18,21-24 with images from daily *social* life. Just like the sound of the mill, the voice and the song of the musicians will become silent. No more craftsmen will be seen, the light of the lamp will be extinguished and the voices of bridegroom and bride will no longer be heard in the city. It is striking that the short list of the fading pulse of life closes with the voice of the bride and bridegroom. Thus, it is to be assumed that the author intends to place a special emphasis on this image.

<sup>(25)</sup> For detail on 2 Cor 11,2-3 see ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 300-325.

<sup>(26)</sup> Hegesipp (about 160 A.D.) also reports, according to the witness of Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 3.3277; 4.22.4.6), that the Jerusalem community was called “pure virgin” until the appearance of Thebutis and the martyrdom of Simeon because she had not been sullied by foreign teachings. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.22.4: διὰ τοῦτο ἐκάλουν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παρθένον, οὐπω γὰρ ἔφθαρτο ἀκοαῖς ματαίαις; *ibid.*, 3.3277: παρθένος καθαρά καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἔμεινε ἡ ἐκκλησία)

<sup>(27)</sup> Otherwise only still in 1 Cor 8,7 in the NT. Also the metaphoric use in the tradition in the sense of “religious contamination” (See LXX Jer 23,11; Isa 65,4; Tob 3,15), on this see F. HAUCK, “μοιχεύω κτλ.”, *ThWNT*, IV, 744-745.

### 1. *Traditional background*

The “voice of the bridegroom and bride” takes up a motif from Jeremiah. The silencing of the voice of bridegroom and bride is employed in three places in the Book of Jeremiah in connection with proclamations of disaster (Jer 7,34; 16,9; 25,10) while it occurs in Jer 33,10 (LXX 40,10) in the context of a promise of salvation. This formulaic expression thus becomes a symbolic declaration of human joy and an intact social community. There exists a direct reference from Rev 18,23 to Jer 25,10 because here the bridal metaphor also appears in association with the light of the lamp and taking over the MT of the Hebrew Bible with the sound of the mill (קול רחמים)<sup>(28)</sup>. In contrast to Jer, φωνή is named only once in Rev 18,23. Through succinct formulations, that, with the exception of v. 22a, constantly bring monomial examples, the author is obviously trying to create a more concise portrayal. More important than the variations in expression is that the author of Rev reverses the order of the examples and now places the voice of bridegroom and bride as the most significant member at the end.

One decisive difference from the assumed background of tradition, however, is that this expression in Jer always refers to the fate of Judah and Jerusalem and closely describes the situation of exile. Indeed the verse in Jer 25 that is decisive for Rev is followed by a proclamation of disaster to befall Babylon (Jer 25,12-16). In this proclamation, although the bride formula is not employed, the image of the “fiery wine” (Jer 25,15) does appear and demonstrates a parallel motif to that of “fierce wine of fornication” (Rev 18,3; cf. 17,2). If the imagery in Jer constantly refers to inner historical events, Rev 18,23 in contrast demonstrates an “eschatologization” because the judgement of the harlot has both a final and simultaneously eschatological character. This expansion into an eschatological event is prepared by the adoption of the motif in the environment of the New Testament, which is substantiated by the early Judaic and rabbinical evidence (cf. Josephus, *Bell.* 6,300-306; b. Ket 7b; b. Ber 6b; DevR 7).

### 2. *Figurative language and metaphoric interaction*

The city in which the joyful noise of a wedding no longer will be heard was personified a few verses previously as a harlot with whom

<sup>(28)</sup> The LXX-Version shows ὀσμὴν μύρου — “scent of the salve” instead of the “sound of the mill”.

kings have fornicated (18,3). Based on the, for Judaic ears, inseparable connection of wedding, marriage and reproduction, one is reminded by the wedding formula in Rev 18,23 of the self-celebration of the harlot who expressly emphasizes that she is not a widow (18,7). Similar to the traditional presentation, i.e. in Isa 47,8-9, this self-confidence is now exposed and turned against itself. Here Rev 18,23 goes one step further. Babylon will not only be a childless widow, she will, moreover, not even be permitted to marry according to Rev 18,21-24. When the voice of the bridegroom and bride falls silent there will be no more weddings. This is true first of all for the inhabitants of the city but, as is suggested by the metaphoric interaction, also has implications for the personified city herself. Babylon is of all things *not* a bride but a harlot.

The image of the silencing of the bridegroom and bride forces the well-known schema of contrast inasmuch as, with the fall of the harlot, no joyful wedding noise will more be heard (Rev 18,23: φωνή ... οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ) until the wedding of the lamb is announced (Rev 19,6-8) with a powerful voice (Rev 19,6: ἤκουσα ὡς φωνήν, compare vv. 1.5) and with praise. While in Babylon the voices of the bridal pair fall silent, Jerusalem becomes the location of the wedding of the lamb. The celestial city herself will even be a bride (Rev 21,2.9).

#### IV. The wedding of the Lamb (Rev 19,6-9)

Within the final vision, Rev 19,1-10 marks the turning point from harlot to bride. The celestial glorification of a great throng is retrospectively concerned with the completed judgement of the harlot Babylon (vv. 1-4), which was already suggested in Rev 18,20 while the earthly hymn extols in anticipation the wedding of the Lamb (vv. 5-8). The woman named in v. 7 and assigned into the possession of the lamb can be interpreted as the "bride". This is made possible by the ambiguous lexeme γυνή and confirmed by the detailed description of her jewelry and robes of fine "byssus linen" that follows it<sup>(29)</sup>. V. 8c creates a break in the hymnically poetic style and acts instead more like a commentative explanation. The previously named βύσσινος is now identified with the righteous deeds of the saints. V. 9 introduces, in the form of a Beatitude, the element of the wedding supper and guests, which is unique to Rev.

<sup>(29)</sup> The varying reading νυμφή instead of γυνή in  $\aleph^2$ ,  $\text{gig}$ ,  $\text{cop}$  (sa/ bo) and in Apringius Pacensis is therefore an understandable correction. On this see also D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 17–22* (WBC 52c; Dallas, TX 1998) 1029-1030.

### 1. *Different elements of the imagery*

Altogether, one can differentiate three elements from the imagery of the wedding metaphor that will be examined more closely below: (a) the wedding of the king; (b) bridal garment and adornment; (c) the invitation to the wedding supper.

#### a) The wedding of the king

Just as the entire section Rev 19,10 is already determined by elements of song<sup>(30)</sup>, the wedding image of vv. 6-8 is also formally composed as a hymn. After the imperative call to praise in v. 5b (αἰνεῖτε τῷ θεῷ) as a typical introduction to the “imperative hymn” (compare Ps 134,1.20 [LXX]: αἰνεῖτε, δοῦλοι, κύριον)<sup>(31)</sup>, v. 6bc delivers the answer in the form of the so-called “Lobsatzrezitation (recitation of praise)”, that is introduced as usual with ὅτι (hebr. כִּי) names the reason for the praise: “For the Lord our God, the Almighty, reigns”. The summons to exultation is now repeated by the crowd as a self-summons (1. pl.) in three variations (v. 7a) in order to then connect to a ὅτι-reason: the wedding of the lamb is now given as the reason for the exultation and the joy (7b).

This entire section adopts elements of OT Psalms. Based on the Κύριος-ἐβασίλευσεν-formula, one recognizes a reference to the so-called JHWH-King-Psalms (Ps[LXX] 92,1; 96,1; 98,1) while the introduction of v. 6a (rushing water) seems to be an allusion to Ps 92,4. Further, the call to joy in v. 7a could have been inspired by Ps[LXX] 117,24b (ἀγαλλιασώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθώμεν). However, the motif of the wedding, a central component of the exultation, is not yet explained with these references. Within the hymn-like texts of the tradition, there is Ps 45 (44 LXX) that creates exactly this connection

<sup>(30)</sup> See K.-P. JÖRNS, *Hymnisches Evangelium. Untersuchungen zu Aufbau, Funktion und Herkunft der hymnischen Stücke in der Johannesoffenbarung* (StNT 5; Güterloh 1971) 144: “hymnischen Finale”. After a double Halleluja praise of a great throng in heaven (v. 1b.2 and 3), the “Amen. Halleluja” of the twenty-four elders and the four beasts can be heard (v. 4), before all God-fearing slaves are called upon to celebrate (v. 5) and to sing the Halleluja praise for the fourth time. This quadruple Halleluja is, according to rabbinical tradition, reserved for the summons to the last judgement: it will ring out over the judgement of the transgressors (b. Ber 9b) or after the construction of the celestial Jerusalem (see Tob 13,21).

<sup>(31)</sup> See the classification of F. CRÜSEMANN, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel* (WMANT 32; Göttingen 1969), that differentiates between “imperative” and “participial hymns”. Similarly K. SEYBOLD, *Die Psalmen. Eine Einführung* (Stuttgart e. a. 1986) 97-98.

between sovereignty and the wedding image and clearly shows proximity in both motif and language to the doxology of Rev 19,6-8, as the table shows:

*Table 1: Comparison of motifs in Rev 19,6–8 and Ps 44(LXX)*

Rev 19,6–8	Motif	Ps 44 (LXX)
v. 6: ἐβασίλευσεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς [ἡμῶν]	(divine) King	ὁ βασιλεὺς ... ὁ κύριός σου (v. 12) ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεός ... (v. 7); (cf. king [βασιλ*] also in vv. 5.6b.7b.10a.15a.14a.16b)
ὁ παντοκράτωρ.	omnipotence	ἄρχοντας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (v. 17b) cf. ἐν πάσῃ γενεᾷ καὶ γενεᾷ (v. 18a)
v. 7: χαίρομεν καὶ ἀγαλλιῶμεν καὶ δόσωμεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῷ ...	joy  glory (Doxa)	ἔλαον ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι (v. 8) ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσει (v. 16) πᾶσα ἡ δόξα αὐτῆς θυγατὶς βασιλέως (v. 14)
ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν	adorned bride	(θυγάτερ ...) ἐν κροσσωτοῖς χρυσοῖς περιβεβλημένη πεποικιλμένη (v. 14, cf. 10.15)
v. 8: καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἵνα περιβάλῃ- ται βύσσινον λαμπρὸν καθαρόν·	wear bright garment	ἐν ἱματισμῷ διαχύρσῃ περιβεβλημένη πεποικιλμένη (vv. 10.14)
τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον τὰ δικαιοῦματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν·	righteousness/ justice	βασιλεὺς ἔνεκεν ἀληθείας καὶ πραύτητος καὶ δικαιοσύνης (v. 5b) ἡγάπησας δικαιοσύνην (v. 8)

Psalm 45 (44 LXX) extols the wedding, taking place with the sheer jubilation and joy of all participants, of a king and a bride adorned in splendid robes. This king legitimizes his power directly from God and is himself addressed as “God” (v. 7). At a time when the political monarchy was long a thing of the past, an idealistic monarchy was described doxologically. It was a monarchy showing clear messianic overtones in formulations such as “anointed with oil, token of joy”, “eternal throne”, and “sceptre of righteousness”. The bride can also be metaphorically interpreted as “Zion”, as is not least suggested by the placement, by the Sons of Korah, of the Psalm in the Hebrew Canon (before the Zion Psalms)<sup>(32)</sup>.

The similarity to the royal wedding of Rev becomes obvious based simply on the parallels of motif. The inter-textual connection between

<sup>(32)</sup> For details on the ‘messianic’ interpretation of the Psalm see F.-L. HOSSFELD – E. ZENGER, *Psalmen 1–50* (NEB 29/1; Würzburg 1993) 278–284, here: 279: “Dem messianischen König wird nun eine neue ‘Königstochter’ zugeführt: die Tochter Zion.”



Ps 45 (44 LXX) and Rev 19,5-8 increases, however, in plausibility above all because Ps 45 (44 LXX) has been interpreted in a messianic sense both in the rabbinical (*Tg.Pss*, *MPss*) as well as the ancient Christian (Hebr 1,7-8) tradition. Additionally, together with Cant 3,11<sup>(33)</sup>, it may have made a substantial contribution to the metaphor of the messiah-bridegroom that then gained a central meaning in ancient Christianity<sup>(34)</sup>. Even the ambiguity already created in Ps 45 (44 LXX) as to the relation between God and king fits into the image of the “Lamb-King” as it is imparted in Rev. The Lamb, whose royal wedding is announced here in Rev 19,5-9, is drawn directly into the realm of God without, however, being identified with God. Thus, the specific Christology of Revelation receives in advance a traditional character in its imagery.

#### b) Bridal garment and adornment

The text speaks further of a woman who has adorned herself as a bride. The bridal garment is often mentioned within the metaphorical tradition itself. Thus, the bride in Ezek 16, metaphorized as Jerusalem, is adorned with byssus-linen, silk and embroidered clothes (βύσσινα καὶ τρίχαπτα καὶ ποικίλα Ezek 16,13[LXX]). The “bride of Zion” in Ps 45 is presented with golden robes (literally “Her clothing is interwoven with gold” — ἐν κροσσωτοῖς χρυσοῖς περιβεβλημένη πεποικιλμένη Ps 44,14[LXX]). In Isa 61,10 “robes of salvation” and “cloak of righteousness” are compared with the garland and jewels of the bride and bridegroom, while the bride, here, can be identified with Zion and the bridegroom in the scope of the Judaic interpretation of Isa 61 can be identified with the Messiah (compare *PesR* 37; *PesK* 22,4). A detailed description of bridal jewelry is handed down in *JosAs* by way of the bride Aseneth (see *JosAs* 18,5-10): she dons a bridal gown, “the first of the wedding, like lightning in its appearance”, puts on a majestic golden belt, dons precious stones, golden bracelets and jewels and places a golden wreath on her head. A transformation takes place

<sup>(33)</sup> Cant 3,11 speaks of the crowning of Solomon on the day of his wedding. The allegorical interpretation of this text according to *m. Taan* 4,8 (wedding day = granting of the Torah) can be seen as the initial of the allegorical Cant interpretation; in *Tg. Cant* the lover of the Song of Songs was also interpreted messianically (see *Tg. Cant* 7,14; 8,1.2.4.).

<sup>(34)</sup> On this see my article R. ZIMMERMANN, “Bräutigam als frühjüdisches Messiasprädikat? Zur Traditionsgeschichte einer urchristlichen Metapher”, *BN* 103 (2000) 85-100; see also according to *Mk* 2,18-22 ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 227-299.

with the bridal jewels. Formerly Aseneth had a “deflated appearance”, but suddenly her face is lighted with overwhelming beauty “like the sun and her eyes like the morning stars etc.” The bridal adornment makes Aseneth’s inner beauty, initiated by the meeting with the celestial people, simultaneously concrete and aesthetic.

The aesthetic dimension of the festive gown is in all sources clearly in the fore. Within the framework of the wedding description, the beauty of the bride and especially also the beauty of her wedding jewelry and garment is emphasized. In Ezek 16 and JosAs, the contrast between the “supernatural” beauty of the bride to her previous simplicity is emphasized. As, previously in Ezek 16, the bride of Jerusalem is considered “worthy of royalty” (Ezek 16,13), Aseneth is also described as a royal bride because she puts on a “royal belt” and takes a scepter in her hand (JosAs 18,6). In looking at metaphoric interaction, the elements of imagery of aesthetics, transformation and royal worthiness must be considered.

#### c) Wedding supper / wedding guests

The image of an eschatological celebratory supper is also widely known in Judaism emerging from the prophetic promise (Isa 25,6; 62,9; Ezek 39,17; etc.)<sup>(35)</sup>. The idea of a final supper is associated, especially in the Enoch literature, with the son of man (Hen[aeth] 62,14; Hen[gr] 42,5). However, no references that identify the final supper concretely as a wedding supper are known.

This combination of motifs is obviously an achievement of early Christianity. A loose association between an eschatological supper and a wedding exists in the section from the Sayings Source Luke 12,35-38 (Q)<sup>(36)</sup>. Further, there are many indications of a formal and contextual parallel between Luke 14,15b and Rev 19,9<sup>(37)</sup>. An exact comparison of Luke 14,15b and Rev 19,9, however, shows that besides the formal relatedness of the Beatitude, alone the basic motif of the invitation to a supper leads one to see a common background of tradition. The concretizations and formulations such as bread-eating in the Kingdom of God or as one invited to the wedding supper of the

<sup>(35)</sup> See references in J. BEHM, “δεῖπνον κτλ.”, *ThWNT*, II, 33-35.

<sup>(36)</sup> A man (master of the house) comes back home after a wedding and knocks on the door (see Rev 3,20). The servants who are awake and who open the door for him are then invited to a meal during which the master of the house himself serves.

<sup>(37)</sup> See, for example, H. RITT, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (NEB 21; Würzburg 1986) 96; BERGER, *Theologiegeschichte*, 608.

lamb show clear differences. Certainly Luke 14,15 appears to be an introductory verse in the parable of the great supper, in which the motif of the “invitation to the supper” then shifts in the narrative into the center (cf. Luke 14,24: κεκλημένοι/δεῖπνον). While in Luke this image is not yet associated with the wedding symbolism, the version of the parable in Mt 22,1-14 shows the exact combination of eschatological banquet and eschatological wedding. Thus, Mt and Rev demonstrate here the knowledge of a common tradition whose source may lie in a Q-tradition of eschatological supper.

## 2. *Metaphoric interaction*

The central statement of the metaphoric section Rev 19,6-9 is: “The wedding of the Lamb has come”. Out of the twenty-nine titular references to ἀρνίον in Rev, twenty-eight of the terms refer to Jesus Christ. The wedding that is extolled in Rev 19,6-9 and to which guests are invited is therefore the wedding of Christ. Jesus is the bridegroom!

A connection between Lamb and sovereignty, as is completed here in Rev 19,6f., exists already in Rev 17,14 as here the Lamb is called “Lord of all lords and King of all kings”. The same term is then taken up again in Rev 19,16 and again clearly refers to Christ, as indicated by the name “Word of God” (Rev 19,13), the image of the sword coming out of the mouth (19,15; cp. 2,12) and above all by the quotation from Ps 2,9 (LXX), interpreted in a messianic sense, referring to the ruler with the iron rod (Ps 2,9; Rev 19,15). The bridegroom whose wedding is extolled here is simultaneously the king whose reign is beginning. In this way, important characteristics of the Christology of Rev can be distinguished. The label of sovereignty κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ (Rev 19,6c), which certainly goes back to Isa 6,2, is clearly assigned to God within the framework of the throne visions in Rev 4,8 and 11,17. In Rev 15,3 it occurs within the song of the Lamb (ὠδὴ τοῦ ἀρνίου). However, precisely these passages make it clear that despite God’s preeminence, demonstrated through the ovation, a monopoly of power has not been declared. Sovereignty is shared within the divine-celestial sphere. God does not sit alone upon the throne, but rather a “co-regency” of the twenty-four elders is described. The same motif is taken up again as a structure of sovereignty in celestial Jerusalem, so that the entire vision of the celestial city ends with the promise of the reign of the king of servants (Rev 22,5). The sovereignty of God and Lamb also become closely related here, to the point of identity, for the throne of God is

simultaneously the throne of the Lamb (θρόνος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγνίου, Rev 22,1–3; 7,10.17; cp. 5,6.11). Looking at Rev 19, one can conclude that here the reign of God and the sovereignty of Christ are also indivisibly joined and must not be separated. Regarding Rev 17,14 and 19,16, one can also connect the begin of the reign of the king described in 19,6 to the kingdom of the Lamb. The reference to God should, however, not be overemphasized in a Christological sense upon the background of PsLXX 44,7 and 92,1. Certainly there already exists a synopsis of God and Christ that may have been employed consciously and that was able to form the breeding ground for the later “explicit Christology”<sup>(38)</sup>.

Let us now turn to the bride of the Lamb. The text provides little help in the interpretation of who is actually represented in the imagery of the bride. A reference back to Rev 12 is created by the clearly conscious use of the term γυνή (the author also knows νύμφη, see 21,2.9)<sup>(39)</sup>. The woman in Rev 12 is also “splendidly” clothed (περιβεβλημένη, Rev 12,1) for she is robed with the sun. However, we meet the pregnant woman of Rev 12 in a stage in a woman’s life that is much later than that of the bride. The allegorical provision in Rev 19,8c (“for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints”) could give another clue to the designation of the bride. As the linen was first introduced as the clothing of the bride, the bride is identified with the saints by way of the parallel phrases. The clothing then refers to the righteous acts in the sense of an analogue structure. Of course, the celestial bride could also be robed in the righteous acts of the saints, so that the saints and the bride do not have to be identical. This is suggested in the continuation in Rev 19,9 for if the saints are identical with those that are said to be lucky, those invited to the wedding can not simultaneously be the bride herself. Thus, the identity of the bride

<sup>(38)</sup> Cf. M. KARRER, “Sprechende Bilder: Zur Christologie der Johannesapokalypse”, *Metaphorik und Christologie* (ed. J. FREY – J. ROHLS – R. ZIMMERMANN) (TBT; Berlin – New York forthcoming); on the later metaphorical Christology see E. GRÜNBECK, *Christologische Schriftargumentation und Bildersprache. Zum Konflikt zwischen Metapherninterpretation und dogmatischen Schriftbeweistraditionen in der patristischen Auslegung des 44.(45.) Psalms* (Leiden 1994).

<sup>(39)</sup> Otherwise γυνή was used for looking at the prophet Isebel with clearly negative connotations (Rev 2,20); in Rev 9,8 woman’s hair serves as a contrastive point of comparison to the grasshoppers, while in Rev 14,4 the virginal have not defiled themselves with women. In Rev 17,3.4.6.7.9.18 the harlot Babylon is consciously addressed as a woman.

is still hidden from the reader at this point and is not addressed again and answered until Rev 21,1-9 and 22,17.

The scenario that has been developed up to this point is expanded in Rev 19,9. Instead of learning about the bride, we learn about the guests invited to the banquet. In this way, the Judaic tradition of the eschatological feast is certainly taken up. The fact that the observer is commanded to put the beatitude into writing suggests that it is the church that is addressed here. The entire scene, however, does not only lay the groundwork for the vision of the celestial bride of Jerusalem, but itself, through the motifs of the great throng, voice, Lamb and chosen ones, is closely connected to the anticipatory visions in Rev 7,9-19 and 14,1-4.

## V. The celestial bride Jerusalem (Rev 21,2.9)

### 1. *The image in the context of the vision of Jerusalem*

The vision of the city of Jerusalem descending from heaven in the final chapters of Rev can be divided into two sections closely connected to one another. That which appears at first only sketchily in Rev 21,1-8 is then described in detail in Rev 21,9-22,5<sup>(40)</sup>. At the beginning of each section the celestial city is compared to and identified with a bride (Rev 21,1.9). The two sections are connected to each other to the point of their literal formulations and are arranged chiasmatically. In Rev 21,2, it is the sacred city, described as a bride only in the second part of the verse, that is seen first while in Rev 21,9-10 it is the vision of the bride of the Lamb that is first promised and what is then shown is the sacred city. Rev 21,9 takes up the thread then from Rev 19,7 with the formulation “wife of the Lamb” and makes clear, in combination with *νύμφη*, that the celestial city of Jerusalem is identical to the bride of the Lamb. However, the bride is not characterized in any further detail other than her declaration and assignment to the Lamb. This is different in Rev 21,2. The sphere of images that is first introduced with the comparative particle *ὡς* <sup>(41)</sup> is made concrete in so far as the bride is adorned (*κεκοσμημένη*), with

<sup>(40)</sup> Individually, the following assignments are possible: 21,2–21,9-11; 21,3–21,22-23 and 22,3; 21,4–22,2; 21,6–22,1; 21,7–22,4; 21,8–21,26 and 22,3.

<sup>(41)</sup> Based both on the interactive interpretation of metaphor and the parallel use of comparison and identification in Joh (see Rev 5,6 with 5,12 and 13,8; 4,6 and 15,2a with 15,2b) no difference to Rev 21,9 exists here.

which the particle, named above, ἡτοιμασμένη is illustrated. In this way, Rev 21,2 is also closely associated to Rev 19,7 for precisely the preparation of the bride (ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν) was also mentioned within the wedding hymn. Thus, the three bridal passages Rev 19,7-8; Rev 21,2 and 21,9 are woven closely together.

## 2. Traditional background: Jerusalem/Zion as bride and wife

The conception of a city as a female figure has a long history especially in the western Semitic-Syrian region and it also occurs in the Judeo-Christian tradition, above all in prophecy<sup>(42)</sup>. The starting point for this tradition could be the idea of the ancient oriental city goddess as she appears, for example, in Sumerian texts<sup>(43)</sup>. Even in the most ancient sources, the female personification of cities is associated with symbols of weddings. This ancient oriental linguistic tradition then made its way into Judaism and female personifications of cities such as Samaria, Jerusalem or Babylon belong to the characteristic wealth of metaphors of the Hebrew Bible as well as the subsequent scriptures (i.e. PsSal; JosAs; 4 Es). The city goddesses play a further role in the context of Greek culture as becomes clear in Athene or Roma. In the region of Syria-Palestine and Asia Minor or, in other words, the region of those to whom Rev is addressed, Tyche is known as the city patron in the Hellenistic era<sup>(44)</sup>. Images of such city Tyches (τυχή πόλεως), bearing the characteristic feature of the wall crest as a head adornment, can often be found on coins after 1 B.C.<sup>(45)</sup>.

<sup>(42)</sup> On this see in detail in ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, § 4 2.2. "Jerusalem / Zion als Frau", 117-137.

<sup>(43)</sup> For example see the term "mother" in *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebete* (ed. A. FALKENSTEIN – W. VON SODEN) (Zürich 1953) 192-213; ANET<sup>2</sup>, 611-619; other sources also assign Inanna as a city goddess to Akkade.

<sup>(44)</sup> For example the colossal statue of the city Tyche of Antioch, a work of Eutychedes (approx. 300 B.C.), that still exists in many copies, was world famous. See E. CHRISTOF, *Das Glück der Stadt*. Die Tyche von Antiochia und andere Stadttychen (Frankfurt a.M. 2001); P. PROTUNG, *Darstellungen der hellenistischen Stadttyche* (Charybdis 9; Münster 1995); for the traditional background see A. FITZGERALD, "The Mythological Background for the Presentation of Jerusalem as a Queen and False Worship as Adultery in the OT", *CBQ* 34 (1972) 403-416, here 413-414; Id., "BTWLT and BT as Titles for Capital Cities", *CBQ* 37 (1975) 167-183.

<sup>(45)</sup> For background on ancient oriental wearers of wall crests see J. BÖRKER-KLÄHN, "Mauerkronenträgerinnen", *Assyrien Im Wandel der Zeiten. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale 6.-10. Juli 1992* (ed. H. v. WAETZOLD – H.

Inscriptions to Μεγάλη Τύχη as a city goddess as, for example were found in Bostra, the provincial capital of Arabia (after 106 A.D.)<sup>(46)</sup> complete this picture. The combination of motifs of woman and city can at the least be seen as a fixed image that influenced all of antiquity and was well-known to the author and his readers not only through the adopted tradition of scripture.

Below, we will be interested in the concrete linguistic tradition according to which Jerusalem/Zion is personified as a female figure. According to O.H. Steck<sup>(47)</sup>, the focus of the relational figurations can be differentiated into two aspects. In the one, Zion is depicted in relation to people/inhabitants, expressed above all in metaphors of children, sons, daughters and childlessness. In the other, the female images serve to more closely determine God's relationship to Zion. Here we find the terms "daughter" next to "wife", "bride" and its counterpart "forsaken one" or "widow". Zion/Jerusalem is described as "queen" vis à vis JHWH (cf. Isa 62,3; Micah 4,9; Zeph 3,15.17; Ps 146,10). Certainly both aspects remain closely connected. This has to do with the fact that Zion is enacted, i.e. in Isa 50,1; 51,22; 54,1.4-8(10); 62,4; Ezek 16,8-14, as the wife of JHWH while the relation to God, however, also reflects the relationship of the people to JHWH. In the image of a disordered or successful/promised marital union, the historically experienced relation to God is in each case thematized in the example of the city of God. The fornication<sup>(48)</sup>, forsakenness, widowhood of Jerusalem etc. thus stand for the presently experienced or retrospectively interpreted experience of exile, while a successful relationship (betrothal, young love) is depicted in memory or the promise of the return to Zion. While in Hos, Jer and Lam, adultery and unfaithfulness are categorized into a context of guilt, the hopeful perspective dominates above all in Isaiah. Here the catastrophes of

---

HAUPTMANN) (HASO 6; Heidelberg 1997) 227-234 (Table 13.16), for the reception in Hellenism see M. MEYER, "Neue Bilder", *Hellenismus* (ed. B. FUNCK) (Tübingen 1996) 243-254 with Figs. 1-4.7-12.

<sup>(46)</sup> See *IGLS*, 13,1 Nr. 9006-9009.

<sup>(47)</sup> See O.H. STECK, "Zion als Gelände und Gestalt. Überlegungen zur Wahrnehmung Jerusalems als Stadt und Frau im Alten Testament", *ZThK* 86 (1989) 126-145.

<sup>(48)</sup> For feminist critique see for example R. JOST – E. SEIFERT, "Das Buch Ezechiel. Männerprophetie mit weiblichen Bildern", *Kompendium. Feministische Bibelauslegung* (ed. L. SCHOTTROFF – M.-Th. WACKER) (Güterloh 1999) 278-290; further G. BAUMANN, *Liebe und Gewalt. Die Ehe als Metapher für das Verhältnis JHWH – Israel in den Prophetenbüchern* (SBS 185; Stuttgart 2000).

Jerusalem remain unfounded (Isa 49,14; 54,6) or at least incurred not by the fault of Zion and the belief in being forsaken or divorced by JHWH is rejected as unjustified (Isa 50,1). Mourning will cease and instead Zion will be clothed in robes of glory (Isa 52,1; 61,1-10) and will be loved and adorned as a bride (Isa 62,4-5; 61,10).

The intertestamental adoption of the personified city of God in Bar 5,1-2 and PsSal 11<sup>(49)</sup> could follow directly, as P. Söllner assumed<sup>(50)</sup>, from Isa 61,10 in which the clothing metaphor becomes independent:

Jerusalem put on the clothes of your glory, prepare the robe of your sanctity, for God has declared Israel's happiness for ever and ever.  
ἐνδύσαι ἱερουσαλημ τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης σου ἐτοίμασον τὴν στολὴν τοῦ ἁγιάσματός σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐλάλησεν ἀγαθὰ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι (PsSal 11,7)

However, in my opinion the metaphor of the bride could be also seen in PsSal 11,7 if the term “sanctity” in the somewhat surprising expression “prepare the robe of your sanctity (ἐτοίμασον τὴν στολὴν τοῦ ἁγιάσματός σου)” were, in its conscious ambiguity, to allude to the betrothal (*Qiddushin*). As one can assume that PsSal was originally written in Hebrew<sup>(51)</sup>, “robe of sanctity” could be a confusing translation, because in the original this meant the bride or wedding dress. In this scenario, the verb ἐτοιμάζειν would also take on a specific semantic meaning and would have been employed, as in Rev 19,7-8; 21,2, as a technical term for the preparation of the bride for the wedding. Finally, as PsSal 2,20-21 shows with the lexeme στέφανος, the concept of the wedding jewelry is not foreign to the author of the scripture.

Altogether it can be determined that, within the traditional personification of Jerusalem as a woman, the city of God in her double relation to God and man is described as a self-reliant unity that excludes a simplified identification with her inhabitants or the people of God. Zion assumes, like lady wisdom, an intermediary role into which she

<sup>(49)</sup> PsSal is dated between 48 and 43/42 B.C., which can be determined from allusions to events that took place at that time (murder of Pompeius, but not yet the death of Caesar), see for example J. SCHÜPPHAUS, *Die Psalmen Salomos. Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (Leiden 1977) 106.

<sup>(50)</sup> See P. SÖLLNER, *Jerusalem, die hochgebaute Stadt*. Eschatologisches und himmlisches Jerusalem im Frühjudentum und im frühen Christentum (TANZ 25; Tübingen 1998) 81-82.

<sup>(51)</sup> See the approximate consensus of researchers such as SCHÜPPHAUS, *Psalmen Salomos*, 4; R.B. WRIGHT, “Psalms of Salomon”, *The OT Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH, New York 1985) II, 640.



enters as a person in relation to JHWH and to mankind. From within the intimate relationship with God, the city of God provides for the well-being of her inhabitants and can even create salvation for all people<sup>(52)</sup>.

### 3. *Metaphoric interaction*

Although images used here by John such as the city-woman, metaphors of jewelry and images of marriage and bride are widely anchored in the metaphoric tradition, their employment in Rev demonstrates an original character in two ways. The idea of a city descending from heaven (Rev 3,12; 21,2.9) has not been seen before Rev and does not occur again until the Hebrew *Sefer Eliyahu* 10,4<sup>(53)</sup>. Equally unique is that the expected eschatological city is understood as the bride of the messiah. These characterizations are notable in view of the eschatological and Christological dimension. While the historical perspective dominates in the metaphoric tradition of the city woman, here the new Jerusalem is linked to the “new creation” for in the framework of the compact series of apocalyptic events in Rev 21,1-8 the “new” heaven, or the transcendental sphere, is the place of origin of the holy city<sup>(54)</sup>. At the same time, this eschatological dimension projects into the present. The wedding of the bride and the Lamb is doxologically experienced as already “come” (Rev 19,6). Neither does the “new Jerusalem” remain in heaven, but rather descends from heaven (21,2). That which is eschatologically expected anticipates that which is historically actual, but is described in the image as real and existing. That which can be declared proleptically and anticipated doxologically can thus have an effect on and transform the present.

The combination of the city of Zion with the messiah is anchored in the proximity of Jerusalem to the sovereignty of JHWH<sup>(55)</sup> and the eschatological kingdom of David. Within the tendency in early Judaism to bridge the distance to God with mediary figures, Zion is at the same level as Sophia or the messiah. In the metaphor of the bride, the author of Rev is successful in linking together the concepts of the theology of Zion and of the theology of the messiah that otherwise

<sup>(52)</sup> On this comprehensively ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 219-226.

<sup>(53)</sup> According to SÖLLNER, *Jerusalem*, 191.

<sup>(54)</sup> From this perspective the frequently held debate of a preexistence is made superfluous; more detail on this in SÖLLNER, *Jerusalem*, 192.

<sup>(55)</sup> On this see, for example, B.C. OLLENBURGER, *Zion. The City of the Great King. A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult* (JSOTSS 41; Sheffield 1987).

exist independently next to each other. This is interesting in so far as the female figure of the city of Zion now approaches the male concept of the messiah. This female figure of Zion already has a traditional significance as self-reliant unity and can not therefore be simplified into an identification with her inhabitants or the people of God.

Who, however, is the bridal city in Rev 19-21? If, according to Rev 19,8, the gown of the bride is associated with the righteous deeds of the saints, perhaps the chosen ones, the faithful, are concretely the 144,000 that stand as a symbolic number for the perfected people of God. Indications of the same kind are given by the metaphoric tradition of the JHWH-Israel-marriage to which the people of God appear as a bride and counterpart of God. In addition, several representations of the urbane aspect of the bridal city, such as the twelve names of the apostles on the foundation stones (Rev 21,14), speak for such a classification. Can the bride thus be identified with the Christian church as an eschatological people of God, as many researchers postulate<sup>(56)</sup>? The gown of the bride is not identical with the bride. Further the bride and the church remain separate in so far as the bride and the wedding guests (Rev 19) and the bridal city and its inhabitants (Rev 21) are clearly differentiated<sup>(57)</sup>. The ambivalence in identifying the image, seen already in the Zion-bride tradition, is adopted in Rev, obviously unchanged. The bridal city is most closely linked to the skill of the chosen ones, or the church, and can even be seen partially as a code for the completed church of salvation. On the other hand the relationship between the community and the bridal city is declared not in the sense of a symbolic identity but as a relationship. In this way, the independent character of the bridal city is preserved in relation to her bridegroom as well as to her inhabitants/wedding guests. The holy bridal city is thus not simply a collective term for the sum of her inhabitants but rather has an independent existence that becomes the counterpart of the bridegroom<sup>(58)</sup>.

<sup>(56)</sup> For example Jörns, *Hymnisches Evangelium*, 154; U.B. MÜLLER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (ÖTK 19; Gütersloh 1995) 318.

<sup>(57)</sup> Söllner names contradictions, immanent in the text, that speak against a unilateral identification of the celestial Jerusalem with the holy congregation. See Söllner, *Jerusalem*, 257-259.

<sup>(58)</sup> Thus it is understandable that the celestial Jerusalem and the concept of the female city grew in the later tradition as the image of the church. However a tangible church constitution (i.e. offices), institutional in the sense of later developments, is not yet visible in Rev.

## VI. The Summons of the bride (Rev 22,17)

Within the final section of Rev (Rev 22,6-21) a last reminiscence of the wedding metaphor occurs, in which the bride together with the Spirit summon Jesus to come (v. 17). This summons remains embedded in a final chapter that as a whole, creates the impression of lively moving dialogue<sup>(59)</sup>. The units of speech of different people and groups of people (vv. 10–16.20a: Christ, v. 17: Spirit, bride, the hearer, vv. 18-19: author, v. 20b: church etc.) here are situated next to each other often without connection. In this way the concrete addressees come into view and are addressed in the style of prayer dialogues<sup>(60)</sup> in their community serving God.

Rev 22,17 continues from the speech of Christ in vv. 10-16 without transition or introduction. In addition to honoring himself (see 13.16: I am [ἐγώ εἰμι] Alpha – Omega, the first – the last etc.) the speech of Christ also proclaims statements of judgement (v. 12) and salvation (v. 14) that indicate the separation of the godless from the pious. In v. 14 those who wash their clothes are praised as holy. In v. 17 the speech act changes from indicative exhortation to an imperative challenge carried out by three speakers. While the first two parts of the verse are constructed almost in parallel and end with the same imperative (ἐρχου), the form in v. 17c seems to be opened up by the expression containing two figures and the change of character (imp. 3. sg.). The parallel tradition suggests that an independent logion was integrated here whose basic component is also passed on in John 7,37-38<sup>(61)</sup> and which may stem from the tradition of Isa 55,1<sup>(62)</sup>.

1. *The image and its donor field*

Focussing on the object of our examination, it is above all the statement in Rev 22,17 that a bride summons her bridegroom to come that is interesting. As the donor field of this metaphor we can look at

<sup>(59)</sup> See MÜLLER, *Offenbarung*, 367.

<sup>(60)</sup> See K. BERGER, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg 1984) 313-314. According to Berger, the calls for help and salvation stem from the Hellenistic audience style, but can already be found in early Judaic literature. See similar formal structure in Jub 10,3-8.9; 12,19-24; *PJ* 1,5-6/1,7; 3,6-7/3,8; 3,9/3,10; ActThom 158.121.

<sup>(61)</sup> See the practically identical vocabulary τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω ... ὕδατος ζῶντος (Joh 7,37-38); similarly also in John 4,14.

<sup>(62)</sup> See FEKKES III, *Prophetic Tradition*.

two situations within the Judaic marriage ritual<sup>(63)</sup>. On the one hand, the bride could here summon the bridegroom to come to the house of her parents in order to accompany her to his house and thereby to bring the actual wedding to its commencement. There could be a longer period of up to one year between the betrothal (*Qidduschin*) and the actual wedding. According to the rabbinical tradition, this waiting period was brought to an end by the request of the bridegroom to the bride that she should keep herself in readiness for the wedding<sup>(64)</sup>. On the other hand, the background could be a summons of the bride to the bridegroom to come to her in her bridal chamber in order to consummate the marriage sexually. According to Tob 7,18 and 8,1 as well as several rabbinical sources<sup>(65)</sup>, the bride was first in the bridal chamber in order to receive the bridegroom there.

Looking at a figurative use of the scene, the intention of both aspects differ very little. Each time, the request goes from the bride to the bridegroom to come into closer association with her and thereby at the same time to bring the preceding state to an end. It could be that he takes her to his house in a bridal procession and thereby puts an end to her living with her parents or it could be that he becomes one with her through sexual intercourse in the bridal chamber and thereby ends her virginity. In either case, however, it is surprising that it is not the bridegroom who summons the bride but rather the bride who summons the bridegroom. Such an initiative on the part of the bride is unusual and suggests a metaphoric profundity that will be examined below.

## 2. Traditions and metaphoric interaction

The designation of the one who is required is clear because of the contextual assignment of the imperative ἔρχου. Jesus announces his arrival several times (vv. 7.12.20). The answer to this promise is the confirming summons that goes out in v. 17 from the Spirit, the bride and a hearer. At that point it does not have a direct addressee but then receives one in v. 20 through the vocative: The Lord Jesus shall come (ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ)! Thus Jesus is the bridegroom whose union the bride requests in v. 17.

<sup>(63)</sup> On this see the portrayal in this author, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, Exkurs 4, 230-257, as well as R. ZIMMERMANN, "Das Hochzeitsritual im Jungfrauengleichnis. Sozialgeschichtliche Hintergründe zu Mt 25,1-13", *NTS* 48 (2002) 48-70.

<sup>(64)</sup> See m. Ket 5,2; m. Nid 10,5; b. Ket 57b.

<sup>(65)</sup> See Bill., II, 398-399.

But who is making the request here? Who is the bride? Up to this point the bride has been introduced as the wife of the Lamb (Rev 19,7) or as the city of Jerusalem descending from heaven (Rev 21,2.9). However, a combination with the Spirit did not take place. The seer is carried away in the Spirit in order to see the celestial Jerusalem as a bride (Rev 21,9). While the (holy) city in Rev 22,14.19 no longer appears as an independent person, the bride in Rev 22,17 becomes even more concretely portrayed as the speaker than in the metaphors up to this point. Further, the direct context shows clear lines of connection to the introductory section of the epistle. The connection between hearing and spirit can be found there in a stereotypically repeated sentence: "Hear, you who have ears to hear, what the Spirit says to the churches" (Rev 2,7.11.17.29; 3,6.13.22, cf. 13,9). If the hearers here are thus identified as the direct addressees in the congregations that are addressed, then in Rev 22,17 the hearer will be conceived of precisely as the *pars pro toto* of the congregation as a whole. The strict parallelizations with the hearer, however, make it clear that the bride in Rev 22,17 is also not (only) regarded as an eschatological quantity but primarily stands for the concrete church<sup>(66)</sup>. This assumption is supported by the fact that the motif of the upcoming arrival to which the bride exhorts is known to the concrete churches from the epistle (Rev 2,5.16.25; 3,11). The Spirit speaks to the churches in the epistle while in Rev 22,17 the Spirit and the bride together address Christ.

Finally we must ask what dimension of profundity is implied by the summons to come. It is hardly possible to demonstrate a clear reference to the Last Supper<sup>(67)</sup>, for example, by way of the Aramaic prayer "Maranatha" (1 Cor 16,23; Did 10,6). Within the imagery, the water of life is linked to the reference to creation in Rev 22,1, which, because of the title in Rev 21,1, exists in the framework of a new creation. The old order is gone and a new being is there to see. The connotations of the imagery of a bridal summons come together seamlessly here. The summons to the bridegroom implies for the bride not only an intensified union but simultaneously the hope for the end of her preceding situation that, for the church addressed, in Rev is

<sup>(66)</sup> With AUNE, *Revelation*, III, 1228: "Here the bride must be the personification of the church".

<sup>(67)</sup> As for example in J. ROLOFF, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (ZBK 18; Zürich 32001) 212. However there could be an intertextual reference to the suppers mentioned above in Rev 3,20 and Rev 19,9, each of them with connection to the nuptial imagery.

characterized by suffering and threat. Emerging from the desire for a change in status, the presence of Christ is thus implored equally as urgently as a thirsty person longs for water. The combination of the bride and water metaphors brings the reader to call one more meaning into association. Water (thirst) is often employed in Old Testament and early Judaic times as a metaphor for love or even sexual desire (see Prov 5,15-20)<sup>(68)</sup>. The reciprocal determination of the lexemes bride and thirst/water could thus liberate precisely these sexual connotations. The bride's summons will then, however, have received an erotic coloration for the reader. Thus, the summons of the bridegroom into the bridal chamber could become the expression of a passionate and impatient longing for Christ in the hopes of a speedy liberation.

#### VII. The Bride and harlot metaphors as a structural element of the whole of Rev

The analyses have made clear that nuptial metaphors are found throughout all of Rev. Below I would like to show, in conclusion, that the nuptial metaphor can be seen, precisely in its contrast to the metaphor of the harlot, as a characteristic structural element of Rev.

The contrastive comparison of two female figures (harlot – bride) is familiar from the metaphoric traditions of OT prophets, in which the relationship of God to Israel is expressed through the metaphor of marriage<sup>(69)</sup>. This betrothal is shifted into an “eschatological” scope even in the oldest biblical writings with this contrastive theme. After the whorish behavior of the woman (Hosea) was first described in detail accompanied by a subsequent judgement, there is the promise of a future betrothal:

I will betroth you to Me forever; Yes, I will betroth you to Me in righteousness and in justice, in loving kindness and in compassion. And I will betroth you to Me in faithfulness. Then you will know the LORD (Hos 2,19-20).

While this depiction of the new betrothal may seem colorless and simply tacked on in contrast to the graphic punishment for the harlot(s) in the older prophesies (Hos, Jer, Ez), it shifts into the center of the

<sup>(68)</sup> On this see the observations in M. and R. ZIMMERMANN, “Brautwerbung in Samarien?”, *ZNT* 2 (1998) 40-51.

<sup>(69)</sup> On this see BAUMANN, *Liebe*, 91-228; further ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 104-152.

gender metaphor in Isa. While Protoisaiah still uses the image of Jerusalem as a faithless harlot (Isa 1,21), in Dtisaiah (Isa 47, compare Tyros) the counterpart Babylon is illustrated with the metaphor of fornication while Jerusalem and the people of Israel are now only the bride, about which JHWH as the bridegroom is pleased (Isa 62,4-5).

When one attempts to perceive the relational gender metaphors in Rev within this background an overlapping picture appears. The metaphor shows up most clearly in the contrastively constructed complex of the two cities of Babylon and Jerusalem, compared as harlot and bride, in chapters 17–21. Babylon is not only the great harlot (Rev 17,1; 19,2) but she also seduces all the kings and peoples with the wine of fornication (Rev 17,2.4; 18,3; compare 17,15-16) and her name is even “Mother of Harlots” (Rev 17,5). However, it is clear from the beginning that the harlot has received her judgement (Rev 17,1) that brings about her destruction. Not only do all the goods of trade, jewelry, glory and all arts of seduction of the harlot disappear, but according to Rev 18,23 the voice of the bridegroom and bride is also silenced in the degenerating city. That which is very clearly enacted here can be demonstrated throughout the complete portrayal of the judgement. The depiction of the harlot is fashioned, even to the point of the individual formulations (compare introduction), as a contrasting foil to the bride of the celestial Jerusalem<sup>(70)</sup>. After the judgement is finally handed down (Rev 19,2-3), the wedding of the Lamb can be announced with a loud voice as a countermove (Rev 19,6-8). The commencement of the reign of the eschatological king and the wedding come together here and take up the tradition of the royal bridegroom that, emerging from Ps 45, describes the royal messiah and eschatological savior with wedding motifs. The hymn-like style of this announcement can be understood either as doxological anticipation or as an “invitation to wedding” in which the presence of the wedding and the lack of its completion can be brought into a meaningful context. The praising of the wedding guests as fortunate (Rev 19,9) confirms this assumption. In addition to the (Godly)royal “bridegroom Lamb”, which at first dominates, the bride is introduced in Rev 19,7-8. She then shifts into the center of interest in the sections Rev 21,2.9, which are linguistically related to Rev 19,7-8. Here the author creates a link to the metaphoric tradition of the

<sup>(70)</sup> See the lists in SÖLLNER, *Jerusalem*, 251-253; ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 390.

female city, or more concretely the “bride of Zion”, that then is implemented above all in view of her urbane aspects. The metaphor of the bride comes to its climax finally in the visionary presentation of the bride (Rev 21,2.9) and thereby is consciously connected to formulations from Rev 19,7.

The achievement of the author lies in the fact that he has joined the tradition of harlot and bride or bridal city (Zion) to that of the messiah bridegroom. The wedding of the royal bridegroom is made into a turning point through its clever placement in Rev 19. The turning point thus shows the switch between harlot and bride. At the same time, the female figures are completed with male counterparts. While the bride in Rev 19,7-8 is given to the Lamb, the celestial-godly king, as the only bridegroom, the kings (plural!) of the earth have fornicated with harlots (Rev 17,2; 18,3.9). Further, ever more people are integrated into the story. The harlot gets the inhabitants of the earth (17,2) or all peoples (18,3, see 18,23) drunk and the merchants of the earth have become rich through her (18,3.11.15). On the other side, the virginal 144,000 (Rev 14,4) or the wedding guests (Rev 19,9) are assigned to the Lamb.

It can not be doubted that various anticipatory events within the book prepare the contrast of the two cities (Rev 11,2.8; 14,1.8; cp. 22,14.18). Corresponding to this all other gender metaphors found in this book remain closely related to the contrastive program of whoredom and wedding at the end. The sentence, repeated in several variations, that the great harlot has ruined the earth and all its peoples with her fornication (Rev 14,8; 18,3; 19,2) should be read programmatically. This is an idea that was also taken up in the title “mother of whores [μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν] and of every obscenity on earth” (Rev 17,5). At the same time the figurative way of speaking makes it clear that fornication should not be here limited to sexual mores but rather stands within a traditional concept of metaphors that identifies fornication with the service of false gods. Based on the weight that is granted to this metaphor at the end of Rev, one will certainly be able also to understand the other use of formulations of fornication in the scope of this tradition. In this way, one can assume, with H.-J. Klauck, that this traditional assignment of πορνεία and the idolatry suggests the cult of the emperor <sup>(71)</sup>. The harlot Babylon as an

<sup>(71)</sup> So H.-J. KLAUCK, “Das Sendschreiben nach Pergamon und der Kaiserkult in der Johannesoffenbarung”, *Bib* 73 (1992) 153-182.



allegory for Rome and the Roman Empire leads to the cult of the emperor, which was classified as the worship of false gods. That which at first was displayed as exemplary in the false prophet Isebel is, nevertheless, just as valid for the “the rest of humans” that do not convert from fornication (9,21)<sup>(72)</sup>.

However, the wedding of the Lamb is also being developed. The relationship of Christ to the churches has already been characterized in the epistles as a love relationship (2,4). The wreath of life (2,10; 3,11) can be understood as an allusion to the bridal wreath, while the knocking on the door (3,20) takes up a motif out of the meeting of the lovers in Cant 5,2-6<sup>(73)</sup> in order to express the longing for an early union, which then is taken up explicitly in the summons of the bride in Rev 22,17. As in the way, the polarizing contrast of the metaphors of harlot and love/bride occurs within the epistle, thus the central middle section of the visions (Rev 12,1–14,20)<sup>(74)</sup> is encompassed by gender metaphors that each look at collective quantities. The images of the celestial king and the woman giving birth in Rev 12 already express the tension between sovereignty and threat to the churches or the people of God and bring to light even more strongly the mother aspect as the man-woman relation. However, Rev 14,1-5 demonstrates, with its framing scenario and the description of the 144,000, a clear reference to Rev 19,1-10 and thus also to the sphere of bride. Instead of defilement and intoxication with fornication, the 144,000 who are saved can demonstrate “virginity” and “immaculateness” (Rev 14,4) — attributes that are demanded from a bride as prerequisites for a wedding.

To what extent the image of the celestial city ultimately reaches into the life of the church becomes visible on the one hand in Rev 3,12 where the Christians who are proving themselves in Philadelphia, are designated with the name of the new Jerusalem descending from heaven. On the other hand in Rev 22,17, the image of the bride that up

<sup>(72)</sup> Although the central term here within a catalogue of vices can be understood also in the literal sense, the almost identical formulation in 9,21 shows a direct reference to the above:

Rev 9,21:	οὐ	μετενόησαν ...	ἐκ τῆς πορνείας
Rev 2,21:	οὐ θέλει	μετανοῆσαι	ἐκ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς.

<sup>(73)</sup> See A. FEUILLET, “La mystique nuptiale et la réponse de l’homme à l’amour divin d’après Ap. 3,20 et Ct 5,2-5”, *Carmel* 41 (1986) 2-14; also ZIMMERMANN, *Geschlechtermetaphorik*, 445-447.

<sup>(74)</sup> The section Rev 12,1–14,20 can be seen as the inner middle of the apocalyptic main section, as MÜLLER, *Offenbarung*, 225.

to now was reserved for the celestial Jerusalem is quite naturally transferred to the church assembled for the worship of God. Thus the polar foundation metaphor remains also at the end of the book. As in the city of Babylon when the happy voices of the bridal pair fall silent (Rev 18,23), the lascivious people are in analogue shut out of the community in the holy city (Rev 22,15). In contrast, the union of bride and bridegroom is upcoming because the longing summons of the bride (Rev 22,17) shows that the bridegroom has come to within summoning distance.

The dualistic gender metaphors of fornication and wedding can be seen as one of the structural patterns of Revelation as a whole. That which is explicitly implemented in the culminating final vision of the judgement on the harlot and the wedding of the bride is prepared by the author in varying elements (see Table 2). The incorporation of the metaphor in the epistles (chap. 2–3)<sup>(75)</sup>, as well as sections of visions and the end of the book have thus above all the function of linking that which is graphically displayed in the city codes explicitly to the addressees, here the Christian churches. In this way, the statements of fornication, to be seen as the worship of false gods, in Rev 2 and 3 are aimed clearly at the cult of the emperor, which is interpreted as unfaithful toward Christ. The female figure who is threatened in Rev 12 can also be understood as a figure of identification for the persecuted church while at the same time reminding of its sovereign origin that can be understood intertextually as the anticipation of the promised heavenly bride. Like the bride, the chosen ones who were previously placed into the figurative world of bride and wedding through door (3,20), crown (2,10; 3,11; 4,4; 9,7; 19,13) and above all clothes metaphors (see 3,5; 19,8; 22,14) are also described as undefiled and virginal (Rev 14,4).

Nadlerstrasse 17  
69226 Nussloch, Germany

Ruben ZIMMERMANN

<sup>(75)</sup> Here J. Fekkes' too one-sided view that on the one hand recognizes the unity of beginning and end ("fundamental relationship of anticipation and fulfillment between Revelation 1–3 and 19–22"), but on the other hand reserves the nuptial imagery for the final section ("It is only natural that John reserve the nuptial imagery for the latter stage, where it serves to underline the community's transition from temporary hardship and faithful preparation to eternal glory and companionship with the Lord") can be contradicted. See FEKKES III, "Bride", 287, n. 51.

*Table 2: The Contrastive Gender Metaphors in Rev*

	<i>Images of Fornication</i>	<i>Images of Bride and Love</i>
Letters to the Churches (2–3)	Teachings of Bileam lead to fornication (2,14) Prophetess Isebel does not turn away from fornication and seduces into sexual acts (2,20–22)	First love forsaken (2,4) (compare love relationship between Christ and the churches) wreath of life (2,10; vgl. 3,11)  Door scene and supper community (3,20)
Visionary middle section (4–16)	The rest of people do not turn away from fornication (9,21)  (Not defiled with women)	The pregnant woman (12)  The virginal, immaculate 144,000 (14,4-5) are ransomed
Dualistic Finale: Harlot Babylon and bride Jerusalem (17–21)	Babylon wets all peoples with the wine of fornication (14,8) Judgement on the harlot Babylon (17–18): – great harlot (17,1) – kings of the earth fornicate with her (17,2; 18,3) – Wine of fornicaiton makes all peoples drunk (17,2; 18,3) – Mother of harlots (17,5)	Voice of bride and bridegroom fall silent (18,23) The wedding of the bride Jerusalem (19–21): – Announcement/invitation to the wedding of the Lamb (19,6-9) – Preparation of the bride (pure linen) (19,7-8) – Praise of the wedding guests (19,9) – Presentation of the bride Jerusalem (21,2.9)
End of the book	Shutting out of the lascivious (22,15)	Summons of the bride (22,17)

## SUMMARY

In this article is argued that the nuptial imagery of the Book of Revelation is not limited to chapters 19 and 21 but rather runs throughout the book. While the imagery is certainly most pronounced in the final part of the book, it also appears in the letters to the churches (bridal wreath in Rev 2,10; 3,11), in the scene depicting the 144,000 as virgins (Rev 14,4-5), and is encountered again in Rev 18,23 (silencing of the voice of bridegroom and bride) and Rev 22,17 (summons of the bride) at the end of the book. Thus the wedding metaphors can be seen as one of the structural patterns of Revelation as a whole directly in contrast to the metaphors of fornication.

## **Epideictic Rhetoric in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians 1–4**

In his article “Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik”<sup>(1)</sup>, dating from 1897, J. Weiß offers a detailed analysis of 1 Corinthians 1–4. This analysis is restricted to the formal, stylistic characteristics of this passage, but it does justify the conclusion that this is “ein Stück feinsten Schriftstellerei oder Beredsamkeit” (210). Weiß convincingly shows that Paul’s text is highly rhetorical in nature. Thereby he paves the way for closer inspection of the style, the argumentation and the rhetorical genre of 1 Cor 1–4.

It is remarkable that this analysis of Paul’s style by Weiß has hardly been more systematically developed in later research. Standard commentaries of the first epistle to the Corinthians give little attention to the special style of 1 Cor 1–4. The ones who do treat this topic do not investigate the coherence and the function of the four significant changes in style which mark this passage<sup>(2)</sup>. It is still more remarkable that authors, who have recently studied 1 Cor 1–4 from the perspective of Greco-Roman rhetoric, pass by the rhetorical character of Paul’s style in silence. Experts in Classical rhetoric, such as H.D. Betz<sup>(3)</sup>, S.M. Pogoloff<sup>(4)</sup>, D. Litfin<sup>(5)</sup> and B.W. Winter<sup>(6)</sup>, without so much as deigning to look at Paul’s style, unanimously conclude that in 1 Cor 1–4 Paul, for theological reasons, rejects the use of rhetoric in

(<sup>1</sup>) J. WEIß, “Beiträge zur paulinischen Rhetorik”, *Theologische Studien*. Festschrift B. Weiß (Hrsg. C.R. GREGORY *et al.*) (Göttingen 1897) 165-247.

(<sup>2</sup>) This holds more in particular for H. MERKLEIN, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. Kapitel 1–4* (Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament 7/1; Gütersloh – Würzburg 1992) and W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther I.* (1 Kor 1,1–6,11) (EKK 7.1; Zürich – Neukirchen 1991).

(<sup>3</sup>) H.D. BETZ, “The Problem of Rhetoric and Theology according to the Apostle Paul”, *L’Apôtre Paul. Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère* (éd. A. VANHOYE) (BETL 73; Leuven 1986) 16-48, esp. 36-37.

(<sup>4</sup>) S.M. POGOLOFF, *Logos and Sophia*. The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians (SBL DS 134; Atlanta 1992) 275.

(<sup>5</sup>) D. LITFIN, *St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation*. 1 Corinthians 1–4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric (Cambridge 1994) 190-201, 244-252.

(<sup>6</sup>) B.W. WINTER, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists* (Cambridge 1997) 187, 237-241.

Christian preaching<sup>(7)</sup>. In Paul's view the dynamic of human persuasion and the dynamic of the proclamation of the Cross should be mutually exclusive. Paul defends his *modus operandi* as a preacher. His assignment is to proclaim the Cross simply without rhetorical means, for creating belief exclusively is the work of God's Spirit. In my view, a theological prejudice with regard to the nature of Christian preaching blinds these scholars to the highly rhetorical character of Paul's discourse. Therefore I intend to reopen the question as to the rhetorical character of 1 Cor 1–4.

The present examination is founded on the disposition of the text, which I have proposed in a previous article dealing with the course of the argumentation in 1 Cor 1,10–4,21<sup>(8)</sup>. There I argued that this passage consists of four general reflections, each in a different, highly rhetorical style and followed by a practical conclusion formulated with much less rhetorical flourish. Reflections and conclusions are divided as follows: 1 Cor 1,18–31 concluded by 2,1–5; 1 Cor 2,6–16 concluded by 3,1–4; 1 Cor 3,5–23 concluded by 4,1–5; 1 Cor 4,6–13 concluded by 4,14–21. This time I focus my attention more in particular on the rhetorical character of the four general reflections. Two indications determine the direction of this investigation. Weiß clearly shows that each of these sections exhibits a distinct style, characterized in each case by an abundant use of rhetorical figures. A second observation is that in each of these sections Paul qualifies or disqualifies certain persons or groups of persons. From a rhetorical point of view these two phenomena point to the epideictic genre<sup>(9)</sup>.

(7) The recent commentary of A.C. THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids – Carlisle 2000) shares this view. According to this author, one of the advantages of attention to rhetoric in Paul is that this underlines “the priority of theological content and the reproclamation of the cross over the “clever” use of forms, which Pogoloff and Winter (among others) readily demonstrate” (49). As a consequence no attention is given to the stylistic devices which Paul applies in 1 Cor 1–4.

(8) J.F.M. SMIT, “What is Apollos? What is Paul?” In Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10–4:21”, *NovT* 44 (2002) 231–251.

(9) In her study *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (HUT 28; Tübingen 1991) M.M. MITCHELL has a section on “Epideictic Elements in 1:18–4:21” (213–225). To my knowledge she is the only one to notice a connection between this passage and epideictic rhetoric. She takes this approach: “It is fascinating to see how Paul's censure of the Corinthian church here proceeds along the lines which Quintilian recommended for praising or blaming a city” (215). This approach is rather infelicitous and leads to a forced and artificial interpretation.

Consequently this genre forms the frame of reference of the present investigation.

The presentation of my findings is divided into three parts. First, I give a succinct survey of the principal characteristics of the epideictic genre as set out in the various Greek and Latin handbooks of rhetoric. Next, in the light of this, a description follows of the particular rhetorical character of each of the four general sections mentioned. Finally some conclusions round off my findings.

### I. The Characteristics of Epideictic Rhetoric

In order to analyse four important parts of 1 Cor 1–4 I shall use the standard form of epideictic rhetoric as elaborated in the handbooks from Greco-Roman Antiquity. In view of this I shall now, first of all, give an overview of the main characteristics regarding objective, style, topics, argument and types by which this rhetorical genre is distinguished from both other genres <sup>(10)</sup>.

Within rhetorical theory it is, since Aristotle, regular practice to distinguish three genres from each other and to give them a separate treatment <sup>(11)</sup>. The forensic speech (γένος δικανικόν; *genus iudiciale*) pleads, in the sense of accusing and defending, for the legitimacy or illegitimacy of a committed act. The court-room is the appropriate place for this. The political speech (γένος συμβουλευτικόν; *genus deliberativum*) deliberates, in the sense of recommending or dissuading, upon the benefit or damage which a certain proposal brings with it. This genre is appropriate for the general assembly of the people. The ceremonial speech (γένος ἐπιδεικτικόν; *genus demonstrativum*) evaluates, in the sense of honoring or blaming, the positive or negative

<sup>(10)</sup> An overview of epideictic rhetoric is found in Th.C. BURGESS, "Epideictic Literature", *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology* 3 (1902) 89-261 (repr. New York – London 1987). This work is outdated, however, and overtaken by the new, excellent standard work of L. PERNOT, *La Rhétorique de l'Éloge dans le Monde Gréco-Romain* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes. Série Antiquité 137-138; Paris 1993). A very useful survey of Greek rhetorical terminology is R.D. ANDERSON, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*. Connected to Methods of Argumentation, Figures and Tropes from Anaximenes to Quintilian (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 24; Leuven 2000).

<sup>(11)</sup> The division in three genres is given among others by Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1.3; *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 1.1421b.9-15; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 1.2.2; Cicero, *De inventione*, 1.5.7; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 3.4; Pernot, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 28.

qualities of a certain person. The appropriate place for this genre is the theatre. In contradistinction to the two first-mentioned genres, in which the hearers fulfil the role of judges, in the epideictic genre they are spectators, to whom the speaker displays his ability<sup>(12)</sup>. The epideictic genre primarily deals with the qualification or disqualification of human beings but, on the analogy of this, it may be applied also to deities, cities, animals, plants and abstract themes such as love and wisdom<sup>(13)</sup>.

An important characteristic of epideictic rhetoric is a style with a very high degree of stylistic ornamentation (κόσμος; *ornatus*)<sup>(14)</sup>. Conspicuous figures of style are frequently applied. In this respect the so-called Gorgian figures play a leading part<sup>(15)</sup>. These are stylistic devices which have been borrowed from poetry and which easily lend an artistic or artificial flavor to a speech. To these figures belong especially parallelism of parts of sentences or complete sentences (ισόκωλον, παράσις), antithesis as to form as well as to content (ἀντίθεσις), correspondences in sound between words leading to assonance and alliteration (παρονομασία), and rhyme (ὁμοιοτέλετον).

The handbooks point out stereotypical sources (τόποι) where the rhetor can find material to honor or to blame a certain person<sup>(16)</sup>. At this point they always distinguish between external circumstances, physical attributes and personal qualities of character. Under external circumstances come descent (εὐγένεια), education (παιδεία), wealth (πλοῦτος), kinds of power (δυνάμεις), titles to fame (εὐδοξία, τιμή), place of origin such as fatherland (πατρίς), native city (πόλις), people (ἔθνος), citizenship (πολιτεία) and finally friendships (φίλοι). To the

<sup>(12)</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1.3 cf *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 35.1440b.13-14; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 3.7.1.

<sup>(13)</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1.9.2; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 3.7.26-28. See PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 131-133.

<sup>(14)</sup> Cicero, *De partitione oratoria*, 72; *Orator*, 37-42.65.174-176.207-208; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 8.3.11-12. PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 333 gives this summary statement: "Dans tous ces textes, le style épideictique est conçu à l'imitation du style isocratique et défini par la recherche littéraire ainsi que par l'emploi des figures gorgianiques et de la période".

<sup>(15)</sup> See for these figures Cicero, *Orator*, 174-176; Demetrius, *On Style*, 1.22-29; *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 26-28. Further BURGESS, "Epideictic Literature", 102; PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 371-380; ANDERSON, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, Endnote, 127-128.

<sup>(16)</sup> Examples of such lists of find-spots are found in Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1.9; *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 35; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 3.6-8. A very ample discussion of the standard repertoire in PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 129-249.

physical attributes belong quickness (τάχος), strength (ἰσχύς), beauty (κάλλος), health (ὕγεια). Among the qualities of character the quartet wisdom (σοφία), justice (δικαιοσύνη), courage (ἀνδρεία) and temperance (σωφροσύνη) are regularly reckoned. This checklist often determines the sequence of an epideictic oration. Next to or in combination with such systematic approach often a chronological order is also chosen in which the actions during the different stages of life are followed. In addition the topos of the proper name or surname deserves special mention<sup>(17)</sup>. By means of a quasi-etymological derivation a speaker may use somebody's name to praise or to criticize that person. Demosthenes, explained as 'the power of the people', is the standard example of this device.

Each of the three rhetorical genres gives preference to a definite kind of argumentation. Aristotle already observes this<sup>(18)</sup>. The forensic plea employs in general the enthymeme. The political deliberation by preference adduces examples. The ceremonial oration mainly uses amplification. By this is understood enlarging (αὐξησις; *amplificatio*) and reducing (ταπείνωσις, *minutio*) certain elements in quantitative as well as in qualitative sense<sup>(19)</sup>. Two important forms of amplification deserve special notice<sup>(20)</sup>. Amplification often consists in accumulating words, synonymous or not, sentences, comparisons. A specific form of such accumulation is the argumentative chain (ἐποικοδόμησις, κλίμαξ; *gradatio*). In this case the principal word of each clause is repeated in the next clause and the chain as a whole exhibits an ascending line. Amplification is, next to this, often brought about by means of comparison (σύγκρισις; *comparatio*). In such case the intended effect is reached by comparing the person concerned with someone who is taller, smaller or of the same height or else with someone who is the opposite of the one in view.

The paradoxical encomium (ἐγκώμιον παράδοξον) is a traditional part of epideictic rhetoric. Such speech deals with a subject which

<sup>(17)</sup> See for this topos Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 2.23.1400b.29; Aelius Theon, *Progymnasmata*, 111; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 5.10.30-31; 6.3.55-56; Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 4.3. Also PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 233-235.

<sup>(18)</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1.9.38-41.

<sup>(19)</sup> *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 3; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 8.4. See also Pernot, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 675-680; ANDERSON, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, s.v. αὐξησις, 26-29.

<sup>(20)</sup> See for this among others *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 3. Quintilian (*Institutio oratoria*, 8.4.3.) distinguishes between four kinds of *amplificatio*: *incrementum*, *comparatio*, *rationcinatio*, *congeries*.



apparently is bad and deserves censure, but in reality is good and worthy of praise. As examples an encomium on death and another one on poverty are mentioned. Generally such speeches combine a playful character with a serious undertone. It is a popular type which is often put into practice<sup>(21)</sup>. Rather late in the Classical rhetorical tradition, within the epideictic genre, four types are formally distinguished<sup>(22)</sup>. They are: encomium on an acknowledged good, for instance a deity (ἐγκώμιον ἔνδοξον); encomium on an acknowledged evil, such as the demons (ἐγκώμιον ἄδοξον); encomium on a person or matter which on the one side is praiseworthy and on the other side deserves blame (ἐγκώμιον ἀμφίδοξον); encomium on a person or matter which is apparently bad or shameful, but in reality good and praiseworthy (ἐγκώμιον παράδοξον). From the fact that this division is only mentioned at a rather late date it does not automatically follow that it was unknown before this time. In my view, the late date at which it is mentioned need not be an objection on principle against the use of this division as a heuristic pattern in identifying earlier speeches of this genre.

## II. Four Types of Epideictic Rhetoric in First Corinthians 1–4

We now focus our attention on the four general reflections which Paul elaborates in 1 Cor 1–4. We shall analyse these, one by one, with the help of the model of the epideictic genre as set out above. The aim of this analysis is to find a clear answer to the question as to whether these passages may be reckoned to epideictic rhetoric and if so, in what sense. In order not to lose sight of the line of thought I shall add, each time as last part, a remark on the function which the passage

<sup>(21)</sup> Rhetorical handbooks from Classical Antiquity give little or no attention to this type of speech. There is sufficient evidence, however, to be certain that such speeches were very popular during the entire Greco-Roman period. See BURGESS, "Epideictic Literature", 157-166; PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 19-20.532-546. A late example is ERASMUS, ΜΩΡΙΑΣ ΕΓΚΩΜΙΟΝ. The introduction to this paradoxical encomium on folly contains a pun on the name of Thomas More (Moria) to whom the work is dedicated and also an enumeration of a long series of paradoxical encomia from Classical Antiquity.

<sup>(22)</sup> Menander Rhetor I.346.9-25. See the discussion of this passage in PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 536-541. Pernot (104) dates this work in the second half of the third century C.E., but keeps the possibility open that this division is of an earlier date and goes back to one of the predecessors of this author (538).

under discussion fulfils within the argument of 1 Cor 1–4 as a whole<sup>(23)</sup>.

### 1. *First Corinthians 1,18-31*

In this passage a number of persons are evaluated. In vv. 20-25 the crucified Christ is paramount, more in particular the different estimations which are attached to him. The seekers after signs and wisdom revile him as a scandal and a folly. Those who are called praise him as God's power and God's wisdom. In vv. 26-29 the valuation of two groups of people is at stake. People without status are chosen by God. People possessing status are shamed (κατασχύνω) by Him. Human beings cannot boast in themselves (καυχάομαι) before God. In the framing verses 18-19 and 30-31 it is made clear that in the end the wise are nowhere, their status is nullified, they have nothing to boast of. The foolish believers without status are in Christ Jesus, who is their wisdom and redemption, they boast in the Lord.

This passage contains a profusion of Gorgian figures of style. It almost completely consists of parallelisms, in which antitheses are dominant. The most prominent of these are vv. 18.22-24.25.27-28. Anaphora very often occurs; ποῦ (v. 20) and οὐ πολλοί (v. 26) are most conspicuous. Paronomasia can also be observed regularly; see among others σοφία in vv. 20-21. In the two quotations from Scripture this figure is further enhanced by alliteration, respectively by means of the letter sigma (σ) in v. 19 and of kappa (κ) in v. 31. With respect to this figure also the formula τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα (v. 28) is worth mentioning.

The qualifications of scandal and folly versus power and wisdom, which are attributed to the crucified Christ, belong to the standard repertoire of epideictic rhetoric. This holds even more clearly for the qualification of the Corinthians as not wise, but foolish; not influential, but weak; not of noble birth, but of lowly and despised origin. Moreover in vv. 18-19 by using the verb ἀπόλλυμι twice, Paul makes an allusion to the name of Apollos. By means of a quasi-etymological connection he suggests that the followers of Apollos will perish<sup>(24)</sup>.

<sup>(23)</sup> In my previous article, "What is Apollos? What is Paul?", I give a thorough justification of my view of Paul's argumentation in 1 Cor 1–4. In the description of the function of each passage, added as last part of the analysis, I summarize the principal conclusions of this article.

<sup>(24)</sup> For a justification of this pun on the name of Apollos see SMIT, "What is Apollos? What is Paul?", 243-244.

The predominant argument in this passage is the paradox. Notably in vv. 20-25 and 26-29 this figure occurs in almost every clause. Although some logical connectives occur<sup>(25)</sup>, reasoning does not figure prominently here. Paul primarily proclaims what God has done. These proclamations of God's acts are amplified one by one, in quantitative as well as in qualitative respect. The statement that God makes the wise get lost is elaborated by means of an authoritative quotation of Scripture (vv. 18-19). That God makes the wisdom of the world foolishness forms the culmination of a series of rhetorical questions, which are arranged in increasing length (v. 20). God's decision to save the believers is enlarged by placing it within his all-embracing wisdom (v. 21). The proclamation of the crucified Christ as God's power and God's wisdom forms the culmination of an extended preparatory period (vv. 22-24) and subsequently is once again underlined by the oxymoron of verse 25. God's election of people without status to shame those with status is impressively amplified; the three brief qualifications of verse 26 (anaphora, asyndeton, ellipsis) are amply elaborated in vv. 27-29 (anaphora, polysyndeton, redundant repetition). Also in this case the period forms a climax and ends in an oxymoron (v. 28). God's salvation of the believers in Christ Jesus is enlarged successively by means of a relative sentence, a threefold polysyndetic enumeration and an authoritative quotation of Scripture (vv. 30-31).

This passage not only shows many characteristics of epideictic rhetoric, it also appears to belong to a definite type of this genre. Paul plays a paradoxical game with appearance and reality. The crucified Christ, apparently the culmination-point of shame and folly, he praises as in reality God's power and God's wisdom. This turns all normal relations of social status upside down. Those who think to be wise, are in reality foolish before God. Those who are without power, not of noble birth and despised, are in fact chosen by God in Christ Jesus. This apparently is a paradoxical encomium (ἐγκώμιον παράδοξον)<sup>(26)</sup>.

In 1 Cor 2,1-5 Paul brings up for discussion his former visit to

<sup>(25)</sup> These logical connectives are: γάρ, ἐπειδή, ὅτι, ὅπως. Beause of them SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, I, 167-168, concludes that 1 Cor 1,18-25 is a deliberative argumentation. The many artistic literary devices to which he then points plead against this qualification.

<sup>(26)</sup> Without using the term, MERKLEIN, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 203, reaches the same conclusion when he mentions "die ganze Paradoxie der 'Weisheit', die Christus ist" and remarks: "'Sich der Herrn rühmen' heißt: sich der Ruhmlosigkeit, der Torheit, der Anstößigkeit des Kreuzes rühmen".

Corinth. He admits in an exaggerated manner that at the time, his appearance, according to the generally received rhetorical norms, was far below the standard. The superior logic and the self-assurance of the succesful rhetor were totally missing<sup>(27)</sup>. In the paradoxical encomium, however, he demonstrates that before God wholly different standards apply. For God chooses the folly of preaching and the things that are despised in the world. Paul's previous appearance did fully comply with these most high, divine norms. So the criticism, which the Corinthians level against this appearance as inferior in rhetorical respect, is null and void.

## 2. *First Corinthians 2, 6-16*

The subject of this entire passage is 'we', that is to say the preachers Paul and Apollos. The intention clearly is to place this 'we' upon a high pedestal. They speak God's hidden wisdom (vv. 6-9). To them God has revealed this wisdom by the Spirit (vv. 10-12). They are pneumatics who have the mind of Christ (vv. 13-16). 'We' are presented as speakers, whom God in person has inspired and to whom He has revealed his deepest secrets.

This passage consists of lengthy periods. These are marked by numerous, often redundant, repetitions of words in literal or varied form (παρονομασία) and also by many explanatory appositions. These devices lend a lofty, solemn character to this passage<sup>(28)</sup>.

The theme of 'divine inspiration' is typical of epideictic rhetoric. It belongs to this genre that speakers plead to be inspired by a deity regarding the form as well as the content of their oration<sup>(29)</sup>.

<sup>(27)</sup> Compared to the picture of the rhetor as sketched by Quintilian in *Institutio oratoria* 12.5 Paul depicts himself as an anti-rhetor. This is rightly observed by L. HARTMAN, "Some Remarks on 1 Cor. 2:1-5", *SEÅ* 39 (1974) 109-120, esp. 117-118.

<sup>(28)</sup> Repetitions in vv. 6-9 are: σοφίαν, λαλοῦμεν; τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; ἔγνωκεν, ἔγνωσαν; οὐ, οὐδεῖς...ἀλλά; ἃ, οὐκ. Appositions are: οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; τῶν καταργουμένων; ἐν μυστηρίῳ, τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην; ἣν προώρισεν...ἣν οὐδεῖς τῶν ἀρχόντων... Repetitions in vv. 10-12 are: πνεῦμα (6x); τοῦ θεοῦ (5x), τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἀνθρώπων, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα. Appositions are: καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ; τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ. Repetitions in vv. 13-16 are: ἃ (cf v. 9); λαλοῦμεν (cf vv. 6.7); ἐν διδακτοῖς; πνευματικός (4x); συγκρίνω, ἀνακρίνω; τίς γὰρ (cf v. 11); νοῦν κυρίου, νοῦν χριστοῦ; γνῶναι, ἔγνω (cf v. 8). Appositions are: πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες; καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι.

<sup>(29)</sup> This theme is amply discussed by PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 625-

This passage rests on three statements which are amplified at length. This elaboration is effected by further explaining some key-notions by means of distinctions. Most of these are clearly recognized by the construction οὐ...ἀλλὰ (vv. 6-7.8-9.12.13). In vv. 6-9 the statement: "Wisdom we do speak among adults", is elaborated by distinguishing twice between the wisdom of this aeon and the wisdom of God (vv. 6-7.8-9). In vv. 10-12 the statement: "To us God has revealed (his hidden wisdom) by the Spirit", is elaborated by enlarging on the Spirit. First, the Spirit of God and the human spirit are distinguished from and compared to one another. Next, it is remarked that this Spirit is not the spirit of the cosmos, but the Spirit of God. In vv. 13-16 the statement: "This (wisdom given by God) we do speak", is further explained. First, distinction is made between speaking with human learning and speaking with the learning of the Spirit. Next follows the distinction between a psychic person who has no understanding of spiritual things and a pneumatic person who has such understanding and who judges everything in a spiritual manner. In the three parts of this passage a similar dissociation is brought about<sup>(30)</sup>. Two levels are sharply distinguished from each other: the level of God's wisdom which is open to God's Spirit and the level of the wisdom of this aeon which is open to the human spirit. 'We', Paul and Apollos, are here lifted up from the level of human wisdom and understanding to that of divine wisdom and spiritual understanding.

The analysis of this passage suggests that it belongs to epideictic rhetoric and also that it represents a definite type of this genre. This passage deals with a subject which deserves the highest honor, namely the eternal, hidden wisdom of God. According to v. 7 this glory reflects on 'us', Paul and Apollos, to whom God has revealed his deepest secrets by his Spirit and who, taught by this Spirit, speak about this in a spiritual manner. This seems to be an exalted, honorable encomium (ἐγκώμιον ἑνδοξόν).

After Paul has emphatically stated that he, just as Apollos, has

---

635. His conclusion reads: "L'inspiration divine est donc, en rhétorique, un trait spécifique à l'éloquence épideictique de l'époque impériale, à laquelle elle confère une dignité particulière. L'éloge a des liens privilégiés avec le sacré. Déjà revêtue d'une autorité sociale et politique, la parole épideictique acquiert désormais une autorité pneumatique" (635).

<sup>(30)</sup> For this notion of dissociation see C. PERELMAN – L. OLBRECHTS-TYTECA, *Traité de l'Argumentation. La Nouvelle Rhétorique* (Bruxelles 1988) Chapitre IV: La Dissociation des Notions, 550-609.

been enabled to speak superior divine wisdom, in 1 Cor 3,1-4 he brings up for discussion his previous appearance in Corinth again. It is not his fault that this was a poor performance. For he was quite capable of teaching them divine wisdom. The Corinthians themselves are to blame. As neophytes, as infants in Christ, they were not up to digest such spiritual teaching intended for mature believers only.

### 3. *First Corinthians 3,5-23*

This passage deals with the relations of Paul, Apollos and the Corinthians to one another and to God. Its intention is to determine the correct order between them on the basis of the status each of them is credited with<sup>(31)</sup>. In vv. 5-8 the status of Paul and Apollos in relation to God is discussed. In comparison with God they both mean nothing. In vv. 10-15 the merits of Paul and Apollos are weighed against each other. For the time being Paul ranks higher than Apollos, although the final result of their work still has to be seen. In vv. 18-20 the status of the Corinthians in relation to God is discussed. In God's sight the wise Corinthians do not count for much. Their thoughts are futile (μάταιοι). In vv. 21-23 as a result of the preceding discussion (ὥστε) the mutual order is defined. Paul and Apollos are inferior to the Corinthians, but they in their turn are inferior again to Christ and God.

Typical of this passage are three metaphors, which are developed in an allegorical manner. Characteristic also is that in this passage, at all levels, a tripartite form is employed<sup>(32)</sup> which usually shows an ascending line. The three metaphors accumulated in this section are: agriculture, house building and the temple (vv. 5-17). Each of these is elaborated in a tripartite sequence. Agriculture is elaborated in the triplet: to plant, to water and to make grow. This triplet itself is repeated three times (vv. 5-8). The next, connecting, verse consists of an accumulation of three metaphors: fellow workers, field, building; anaphora and asyndeton enhance the impact of this accumulation (v. 9). Building is elaborated in the triplet: laying of the foundation, building on it and testing of the result. This sequence is repeated twice (vv. 10.11-15). The building materials are also arranged in two series

<sup>(31)</sup> With MERKLEIN, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 258, who remarks: "Die einleitenden Fragen in V. 5ab lassen darauf schließen, daß der Text *werten* will."

<sup>(32)</sup> In 1 Cor 13 Paul uses a similar rhythm, see J. SMIT, "The Genre of 1 Corinthians 13 in the Light of Classical Rhetoric", *NovT* 33 (1991) 193-216, esp. 204-205.

of three (v. 12). The next connection consists of a threefold elaboration of the metaphor of the temple of God (vv. 16-17). The conclusion is a climax consisting of three steps: all things are yours, you are of Christ, Christ is of God. The elaboration of 'all' is a polysyndetic enumeration of three times three elements (vv. 21b-23).

In vv. 5-8 Paul, Apollos and God are evaluated on the basis of their achievements, respectively planting, watering and making grow. In vv. 10-15 Paul and Apollos are evaluated first on the basis of the nature of their work: laying the foundation and building on it. Next the result of their work, more in particular the permanence of it, functions as the criterion they are evaluated by. In vv. 18-20 the Corinthians are evaluated on the basis of their wisdom. Theirs is would-be wisdom, which in God's sight is folly and means nothing.

Accumulation (ἐποικοδόμησις, κλίμαξ, *gradatio*), one of the standard forms of amplification (αὐξησις), plays an important part in this passage. In vv. 21-23 this figure is applied exactly in the approved manner. The connections in vv. 9 and 16-17 offer somewhat less strict executions of the same figure. Finally, the other tripartite forms, which have been identified in the paragraph on style, may also be considered as applications of this figure in a more loose manner. Next to this, comparison (σύγκρισις), the second standard form of amplification, also holds an important place in this passage. In vv. 5-8 two unimportant actors, Paul and Apollos, and an important one, God, are compared to each other within the same category of agriculture. In vv. 10-15 comparison is made between two more or less equally important actors, Paul and Apollos, within the category of building.

The climax in vv. 21-23 forms the conclusion of this entire passage, in which the status of the different actors is defined. The result is a ranking, in which the Corinthians hold the middle position. On the one side they are superior to Paul and Apollos, but on the other side they are inferior to Christ and God. Besides, Paul himself also holds a middle position. Compared to God he is on one line with Apollos and means nothing. In the mutual comparison with his colleague he, who has planted and laid the foundation, clearly ranks above Apollos, who has only watered the plants and built on the foundation which was already there. In the end the Corinthians are credited with an ambivalent position. Their position is higher and more honorable than the one of Paul and Apollos, but lower and less honorable than the one of Christ and God. So this might be called an ambivalent encomium (ἐγκώμιον ἀμφίδοξον).

In the light of this analysis Paul's terminology deserves special attention. His choice of words reminds one of the genre and stylistic devices he applies. "To make grow" (αὐξάνω) in vv. 6.7 is close to "enlargement, augmentation" (αὐξησις), the technique applied preeminently in epideictic rhetoric. "To build on, to build up" (ἐποικοδομέω) in vv. 10.12.14 evokes "accumulation, climax" (ἐποικοδόμησις)<sup>(33)</sup>, a stylistic figure which Paul repeatedly uses here. The opposition between "gold, silver, precious stones" and "wood, hay, straw" in v. 12<sup>(34)</sup> may be a reminder of the ornate style with brilliant stylistic devices, known as "ornamentation" (κόσμος, *ornatus*)<sup>(35)</sup> and of the plain style without ornament, known as "dry" (ξηρός, *aridus*)<sup>(36)</sup>. Finally, "praise" (ἔπαινος) in 1 Cor 4,5 is remarkable because Paul has said already twice that each worker will receive wages from God (1 Cor 3,8.14) so that a repetition of this term lies more at hand. This choice of terms could mean that Paul is well aware of his application of the epideictic genre and perhaps even that he intends to make the Corinthians aware of this.

Within Paul's argument the ambivalent encomium has a clear function. The appearance of Apollos, who arrived in the city after Paul, has led the Corinthians to estimate Paul's preceding appearance as inferior in quality. The ranking, set up in 3,5-23, is intended to correct this view. On the basis of this order, Paul denies the Corinthians the right to judge him. The Corinthians, themselves inferior to Christ and God, have no right whatsoever to pronounce judgement on Paul and Apollos, who are in the service of Christ and God. By right this judgement only belongs to Christ and God at the time appointed by them (4,1-5).

#### 4. *First Corinthians 4,6-13*

This passage deals with the relation of 'you', the Corinthians, to 'us', the apostles. The intention clearly is to ridicule the swollen pride (v. 6) and the overestimation of themselves (v. 7), which the

<sup>(33)</sup> *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 3.1426b.3; *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, 4.25.34; Longinus, *On the Sublime*, 39.3; Demetrius, *On Style*, 5.270; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 9.3.54-57. See ANDERSON, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, 57-58.

<sup>(34)</sup> On the question of the building materials see the overview of G.D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1987) 140-141; W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, I, 298-300.

<sup>(35)</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 3.7.2; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 8.3.1; 8.3.11-12.

<sup>(36)</sup> Demetrius, *On Style*, 4.236-239; Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, 8.Pro.17.



Corinthians display in their estimation of the apostles from whom they have received everything. Paul's remark that he does not write this to shame the Corinthians (v. 14) betrays that his words may be taken in that sense and suggests that such intention does play a part <sup>(37)</sup>.

This passage is marked by a high degree of Gorgian figures of style. In v. 7 we find an anaphoric accumulation (climax) of three rhetorical questions. V. 8 contains a hyperbolic accumulation (climax) with anaphora and paronomasia (βασιλεύω). V. 9 is marked by hyperbole with homoiototon (-ους; -οις) and merism. V. 10 consists of a threefold parallelism enhanced by anaphora and ellipsis of the verb; each of the three parts forms an antithesis. In vv. 11-12a a paronomasia (ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι) is followed by a polysyndetic enumeration of six verbs in the first person plural. Vv. 12b-13a exhibit a threefold, asyndetic parallelism, each part of which consists of a participle and a verb in the first person plural, forming an antithesis; homoiototon (-μενοι; -ουμεν) further enhances this form. In v. 13b hyperbole reaches a climax all the more impressive because of paronomasia (περικαθάρματα; περίψημα) and alliteration (π).

The Corinthians and the apostles are estimated by criteria current in epideictic rhetoric. The question, raised in v. 7, as to whether fame has been gained on account of someone's own merit or not is a typically epideictic consideration. Wealth and the highest and most honorable social position, that of kingship, mark v. 8. This is followed by the lowest and most dishonorable social position, that of criminals condemned to death, in v. 9. The standard epideictic qualifications of foolish and wise, weak and strong, honored and dishonored are used in v. 10. In vv. 11-13 estimation takes place on account of achievements: six activities are enumerated which typify the apostles as an infamous and poor lot. Then three humiliating qualifications follow: cursed, persecuted, slandered. This series ends with the lowest point of shame, that of being esteemed by everybody as scum and refuse.

The dominant form of argumentation in this passage is the comparison (σύγκρισις) between 'you', the Corinthians, and 'we', the apostles who are their opposite. As already noticed in the paragraph on style, in the introduction and elaboration of this comparison accumulation (ἐποικοδόμησις) also plays a part. After the introduction of v. 7, the comparison begins in v. 8 with 'you', who are rich and honored. Then in v. 9 'we' are presented as without honor and despised.

<sup>(37)</sup> So, among others, MERKLEIN, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 323.

Next in v. 10 'you' as praiseworthy are set against 'we' as despicable. Finally in vv. 11-13 'we', in opposition to 'you' <sup>(38)</sup>, are sketched as utterly poor and despised. Besides, in this passage irony is also used as an argument. The rhetorical questions in v. 7 are revealing and intimate that the Corinthians have no reason whatsoever to boast in relation to the apostles. Therefore, the exaggerated, glorious position with which they are credited thereupon in v. 8, should be understood as ironic. The following correction in the sense of "I wish it would be true", excludes all doubt at this point. This apparently also holds for the very outstanding qualifications the Corinthians are credited with in v. 10.

This passage shows many characteristics of epideictic rhetoric. More in particular it may be considered as an encomium on the apostles especially to the extent in which they are deprived of all honor, a dishonorable encomium (ἐγκώμιον ἄδοξον) therefore <sup>(39)</sup>. The purpose of this is to shame the Corinthians who presume to give a depreciatory opinion on the apostles and to have them adopt a less high tone.

Again, as in 1 Cor 3,5-4,5, Paul uses some terms which seem to point at the genre he applies. A well-known form of epideictic rhetoric is the so-called ἐσχηματισμένος λόγος, the covert allusion <sup>(40)</sup>. In this form of speech stylistic devices are used to hide or to cover up what one really has to say. It is a technique to wrap up and to mitigate criticism, especially when this criticism is leveled at authorities with much prestige and power. Experts strongly suspect that by using μετασχηματίζω in 1 Cor 4,6 Paul also intends to refer to λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος <sup>(41)</sup>. In the preceding section Paul actually does make covert allusions, especially in

<sup>(38)</sup> Notice the contrast between "already" (ἤδη), which occurs twice in v. 8, and "up until now" (ἄχρι/ἕως ἄρτι) occurring twice in vv. 11.13.

<sup>(39)</sup> MITCHELL, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 221, considers 1 Cor 4,10-13 as a paradoxical encomium.

<sup>(40)</sup> See especially Demetrius, *On Style*, 5.287-298. Further W.C. WRIGHT, *Philostratus and Eunapius. The Lives of the Sophists* (LCL 134; London – Cambridge Mass 1968) 570; D.M. SCHENKEVELD, *Studies in Demetrius on Style* (Amsterdam 1964) 116-134; PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 717, 722-723; ANDERSON, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, 58-59.

<sup>(41)</sup> See B. FIORE, "'Covert Allusion' in 1 Corinthians 1-4", *CBQ* 47 (1985) 85-102; J.T. FITZGERALD, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel. An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence* (SBL.DS 99; Atlanta 1988) 119-122; D.R. HALL, "A Disguise for the Wise. ΜΕΤΑΣΧΗΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΣ in 1 Corinthians 4,6", *NTS* 40 (1994) 143-149; J.S. Vos, "Der ΜΕΤΑΣΧΗΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΣ in 1 Kor. 4,6", *ZNW* 86 (1995) 154-172; R.D. ANDERSON, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 18; Kampen 1996) 222-225.

3,10-15. There, in comparison with himself, he degrades Apollos, but without mentioning his name. For the informed readers it is not difficult to guess to whom vague and general indications such as “someone else, anyone, each” refer. Criticism of Apollos, who is highly respected in Corinth, has to be covered up in general terms by way of precaution<sup>(42)</sup>. So, by the use of μετασχηματίζω in 4,6 Paul does seem to refer to the technique of λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος which he applies here<sup>(43)</sup>. Paul's hint to λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος has an ironic sound. For hereby he suggests that the Corinthians are persons of high standing and great authority, who do not tolerate direct criticism. The ironic remark: “without us you have already become kings” (v. 8) nicely fits in with this<sup>(44)</sup>. Besides, in epideictic rhetoric the encomium on the king (βασιλικὸς λόγος) plays a central part. This type of speech is the standard, the pre-eminent representative of the epideictic genre<sup>(45)</sup>. In this light by mentioning the status of βασιλεύς Paul may be making an allusion to the βασιλικὸς λόγος here. Finally, “theater, spectacle” (θέατρον) in 1 Cor 4,9 seems to have a rhetorical overtone. The theater is the place where epideictic rhetoric belongs. The audience listening to an encomium, fulfils the role of a spectator (θεωρὸς) who judges the show of the rhetor by his competence<sup>(46)</sup>. In this section Paul does not only give a spectacular depiction of the apostles, but at the same time displays his rhetorical skill by means of a spectacular dishonorable encomium. So this section again seems to reveal Paul's awareness of the high rhetoric he uses and perhaps also his intention to impress the Corinthians all the more by this.

(<sup>42</sup>) So, to my mind, in this case the general formulation covers up the more particular purport. Most experts, on the contrary, are convinced that the example of Paul and Apollos covers up a more general message, destined for a number of schismatics who are not called by their names. In this sense FIORE, “‘Covert Allusion’ in 1 Cor 1–4”, 95-96; FITZGERALD, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 99-121. It is my considered opinion, that the real discussion is all the time about the relationship between Paul and Apollos.

(<sup>43</sup>) Paul does give a hint, but no more than that. He does not in so many words reveal that he uses the device of covert allusion. Contra FIORE, “‘Covert Allusion’ in 1 Cor 1–4”, 95-96; FITZGERALD, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 99-121.

(<sup>44</sup>) With FITZGERALD, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 120.

(<sup>45</sup>) Menander Rhetor, II.368-377. See also BURGESS, “Epideictic Literature”, 127-138; PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 77-78.

(<sup>46</sup>) Aristotle, *Rhetorica*, 1.3.1-3. PERNOT, *Rhétorique de l'Éloge*, 440, remarks: “Le théâtre étant par excellence le lieu de la parole publique, le mot *theatron* désigne par extension toute salle de conférence, l'*epideixis* et le public lui-même.”

The dishonorable encomium prepares for the following conclusion. In this highly artistic section Paul brings forward that the apostles, because of all the hardships they endure, have a right to the respect of the Corinthians who owe them everything. In vv. 14-21 he applies this general admonition destined for the Corinthians to his own person as an apostle. He again acts in particular against their depreciatory estimation of his first and up until this moment only visit to them. As an apostle who has begotten them by his preaching, he is entitled to their respect, just as a father should be respected by his children. Their depreciation of him is impertinent. They are like children who feel superior to their father. They should be ashamed.

\*  
\* \* \*

The preceding analysis has demonstrated that the four passages from 1 Cor 1–4 which have been studied probably belong to epideictic rhetoric and represent more in particular four types of this genre: the paradoxical encomium (ἐγκώμιον παράδοξον: 1 Cor 1,18-31), the honorable encomium (ἐγκώμιον ἔνδοξον: 1 Cor 2,6-16), the ambivalent encomium (ἐγκώμιον ἀμφίδοξον: 1 Cor 3,5-23) and the dishonorable encomium (ἐγκώμιον ἄδοξον: 1 Cor 4,6-13). This hardly can be mere coincidence. Therefore the conclusion seems justified that Paul by means of this passage gives a deliberate proof of his rhetorical ability. This forms part of a larger persuasive strategy.

Paul has founded the community in Corinth, but Apollos, who appeared in the city at a later date, apparently has taken the prize. His impressive teaching has led the believers in Corinth to a depreciation of Paul's former preaching. Paul fights this depreciation by following two lines.

In 1 Cor 1,10–4,21 Paul builds up an argument to justify his rather unimpressive performance. To that end, from the four encomia, evaluations of a more general character, he draws four specific conclusions regarding his former preaching at Corinth: this is in accordance with the highest, divine norms (2,1-5); this has been consciously adapted to the starting-position of the Corinthians (3,1-4); the Corinthians do not have the right to judge Paul, because he is in the service of God (4,1-5); as founder of the community Paul is entitled to the respect of the Corinthians (4,14-21)<sup>(47)</sup>.

<sup>(47)</sup> This conclusion I extensively argue in SMIT, "What is Apollos? What is Paul?".

Next to this, by means of the four encomia, Paul gives a spectacular proof of his rhetorical ability. He consciously seems to apply the epideictic genre and apparently intends to show that he has full command of the rules of the art. So, in 1 Cor 1,10–4,21, not only the argumentation, but definitely also the literary form is fully directed towards the restoration of Paul's image. In this section of his letter Paul deliberately presses epideictic rhetoric into the service of his ethos.

If these conclusions are correct, the opinion that in 1 Cor 1–4 Paul rejects on principle the use of rhetorical devices in Christian preaching should be estimated as incorrect<sup>(48)</sup>. Rather the opposite is true. Paul gives a demonstration of his rhetorical ability and presents himself as a competent speaker to restore thereby his status and authority. This apparently is necessary in view of the acceptance of the instructions which he will issue in the subsequent parts of his extended letter. The fact that Paul recognizes this necessity and the way he reacts to it again give witness to his rhetorical competence.

Jacobskerkhof 2  
3511 BL Utrecht  
The Netherlands

Joop F.M. SMIT

#### SUMMARY

In the discussion as to whether Paul uses Classical rhetoric First Corinthians 1–4 plays a key-role. In this article an overview is given of the main characteristics of the epideictic genre and in the light of this it is argued that in 1 Cor 1–4 Paul presents the four types of this genre: a paradoxical encomium in 1,18–31; an honorable encomium in 2,6–16; an ambivalent encomium in 3,5–23 and a dishonorable encomium in 4,6–13. In this manner he gives a deliberate proof of his rhetorical ability so as to restore his image, damaged by the impressive performance of Apollos who visited the city after him and apparently took the prize. So, after all, there seems to be Classical rhetoric in Paul.

<sup>(48)</sup> LITFIN, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation*, 256–257, states the following terms for recognizing the presence of Greco-Roman rhetoric in Paul's preaching: "Hence, to discover in Paul general features of communication which were discussed by the rhetoricians (e.g. the use of metaphor, rhetorical questions, antitheses, etc.) is by no means an automatic indication that the Apostle had embraced Greco-Roman rhetoric as such. To discern with any certainty an indebtedness to Greco-Roman rhetoric in Paul's preaching we would have to discover there what E. Norden called 'striking examples' of the more specific and stylized conventions which were characteristic of the trained orators of the day, such as Dio Chrysostom". In this article I hope to have met these terms.

## The Style of the Second Letter of Peter

Those who have studied the second letter of Peter have often commented on its style. Most frequently noted are the numerous rare words in 2 Pet<sup>(1)</sup> and its penchant for repetition of words<sup>(2)</sup>. Commentators also offer more general impressions of 2 Pet's style, usually critical ones<sup>(3)</sup>. The most extensive discussion of style in 2 Pet

(<sup>1</sup>) R.J. BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* (WBC 50; Waco 1983) 135-37; C. BIGG, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude* (ICC; New York 1901) 224; F.H. CHASE, "Peter, Second Epistle of", J. HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh 1963) III, 807; J.B. MAYOR, *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter* (Grand Rapids 1965; originally published 1907) lx-lxiv; N. TURNER, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh 1976) IV, 142.

(<sup>2</sup>) BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 137; BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 225-26; CHASE, "Peter, Second Epistle of", 808; MAYOR, *St. Jude and St. Peter*, lvii-lviii; TURNER, *A Grammar*, IV, 142. Note, however, that 2 Pet does not seem to repeat words to an unusual degree. 2 Pet repeats 38% of its vocabulary (151 out of 401 words). Six NT writings repeat a smaller percentage of their vocabulary: Jude (26%), Titus (28%), 1 Pet (34%), 1 Tim (36%) and Jas (37%). All others repeat an equal or greater percentage: Phlm (38%), Phil (38%), Col (38%), 2 Thess (40%), Eph (41%), 1 Thess (43%), Gal (43%), Heb (45%), Rom (46%), 2 Cor (49%), Mark (53%), Luke (53%), Acts (54%), 1 Cor (55%), 1-3 John (60%), Matt (60%), John (63%) and Rev (66%). The NT as a whole repeats 64% of its vocabulary (statistics based on R. MORGENTHALER, *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* [Zurich 1958]). There is obviously some relationship between the length of a text and the degree to which it repeats its vocabulary. This may partly explain why Jude and Titus, both shorter than 2 Pet, are less repetitive. On the other hand, Phlm, the shortest NT text, is just as repetitive as 2 Pet, and 2 Thess, which is shorter than 2 Pet, is more repetitive. It seems clear that 2 Pet is not exceptionally repetitive in the context of the NT.

(<sup>3</sup>) E.A. ABBOTT, "On the Second Epistle of St. Peter", *Exp* 2/3 (1882) 49-63, 139-53, 204-19; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter* 137-38; CHASE, "Peter, Second Epistle of", 807-9; J.N.D. KELLY, *A Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and of Jude* (HNT; New York – Evanston 1969) 228; MAYOR, *St. Jude and St. Peter*, xxvi-lxvii; TURNER, *A Grammar*, IV, 140-44; and most recently A. GERDMAR, *Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy. A Historiographical Case Study of Second Peter and Jude* (CB.NT 36; Stockholm 2001) 30-63. B. REICKE also disparages the style of 2 Pet but suggests that it can be seen more positively (*The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude* [AB 37; Garden City, NY 1964] 146-47). So also M. GREEN, *The Second Epistle General of Peter and the General Epistle of Jude* (Tyndale Bible Commentaries 18; Grand Rapids 1968) 18.

is that of Duane F. Watson<sup>(4)</sup>. Watson's work is basic to any further discussion of the style of 2 Pet. One such further discussion is that of Lauri Thurén<sup>(5)</sup>. Thurén says that style is not currently studied as part of rhetorical analysis, and argues that it should be.

The following essay is an attempt to advance description and analysis of the style of 2 Pet. I will do this by making use of Cicero's discussion of the virtues of style, especially as developed by Quintilian, and supplemented by the discussions of others<sup>(6)</sup>. Watson has discussed tropes and figures of speech and thought almost exhaustively. However, he has discussed other aspects of style less thoroughly. A full catalog of stylistic ornament in 2 Pet should deepen our understanding of its style.

In *De oratore* 3.37 Cicero, in the person of Crassus, identifies four virtues of style: correct diction, lucidity, ornament and appropriateness to the matter under consideration<sup>(7)</sup>. He discusses the first two and the last one very briefly in 3.38-39 and 3.210-12 respectively<sup>(8)</sup>. Cicero

<sup>(4)</sup> D.F. WATSON, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*. Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter (SBLDS 104; Atlanta 1988). Watson describes ancient thinking about style on pages 22-26. He then discusses the style of 2 Pet (along with invention and arrangement in the letter) on pages 81-141; he lists the topics of 2 Pet on pages 192-93 and the tropes and figures he has detected on pages 195-97. He summarizes his analysis of the style of 2 Pet on pages 144-46.

<sup>(5)</sup> L. THURÉN, "Style Never Goes out of Fashion: 2 Peter Re-Evaluated", *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology. Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference* (ed. S.E. PORTER – T.H. OLBRICHT (JSNTSS 131; Sheffield 1996) 329-47.

<sup>(6)</sup> On this subject see A.D. LEEMAN, *Orationis Ratio*. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers (Amsterdam 1963) 2 vols.; D.A. RUSSELL, *Criticism in Antiquity* (Berkeley 1981) 129-47; and G.O. ROWE, "Style", *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 BC- 400 AD* (ed. S.E. PORTER) (Leiden 1997) 121-57. Cicero is explicitly dependent on Aristotle's discussion of style in *Rhetoric* 3.1-12, but presents the subject more systematically than does Aristotle. Other discussions of style, in addition to Quintilian's, are found in *Ad Herennium* 4.10-69, Demetrius, *On Style*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Literary Composition* and "Longinus", *On the Sublime*.

<sup>(7)</sup> *Latine, plane, ornate, apte congruenterque dicere*. In *Rhetoric* 3.2 Aristotle mentions only two virtues — clarity and appropriateness. This list of four virtues was apparently developed by Theophrastus. *Ad Herennium* 4.17 gives a list of three virtues of style: *elegantiam, compositionem, dignitatem*. The first of these includes the first two on Cicero's list; the second is one element of the third on Cicero's list; the third corresponds to ornate; Cicero's fourth virtue is omitted. Quintilian follows Cicero, as is indicated by the citations that follow.

<sup>(8)</sup> Cf. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8.1-2 and 11.1. Diction and lucidity are often seen as problematic in 2 Pet; see e.g., BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 137-38.

discusses ornament at some length in 3.96-208<sup>(9)</sup>. He discusses ornament under two general headings — vocabulary (3.149-70) and syntax (3.171-208)<sup>(10)</sup>. He interrupts the latter to describe briefly three styles of oratory, namely the full, plain and middle styles (3.199-200)<sup>(11)</sup>. Elsewhere Cicero describes another threefold typology of styles, namely the Attic, Asian and Rhodian<sup>(12)</sup>.

With regard to vocabulary, Cicero argues that there are three kinds of ornament: 1) rare, usually archaic, words (3.153), 2) new coinages (3.154), and 3) metaphors and other tropes (3.155-98). The first should be used rarely, the second occasionally and the third frequently (3.201). With regard to syntax, Cicero discusses: 1) avoidance of a harsh clash of consonants or hiatus of vowels (3.171-72)<sup>(13)</sup>; 2) the use of rhythm (3.173-98)<sup>(14)</sup>; and 3) the figures of thought and speech that can be used for ornament (3.200-208)<sup>(15)</sup>. Elsewhere Cicero discusses the distinction between continuous and periodic style and the special importance of rhythm in the latter<sup>(16)</sup>.

---

The following essay will not address this issue at length, but some of the problems are mentioned in the discussion of 2 Peter's sentence structure below. I am inclined to see 2 Pet as exhibiting correct diction and lucidity.

<sup>(9)</sup> Cf. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 8.3-9.4.

<sup>(10)</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On Literary Composition* is a treatment of syntax.

<sup>(11)</sup> Cicero discusses Cotta and Sulpicius as representative of the plain and full styles respectively in *Brutus* 201-203, and discusses all three of these styles in *Orator* 20-23, 69-111. Cf. *Ad Herennium* 4.11-16; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Demosthenes* 1-3; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 12.10.58-68. Dionysius of Halicarnassus gives a different set of three styles in *Demosthenes*, 35-end and *On Literary Composition*, 21-24. Demetrius, *On Style*, 36 distinguishes four styles: plain, grand, elegant and forceful. The first three seem to correspond to Cicero's plain, full and middle styles respectively. "Longinus", *On the Sublime* can be seen as a treatment of the full or grand style.

<sup>(12)</sup> Cf. *Brutus* 51; *Orator* 23-27. See also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Ancient Orators* 1-3; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 12.10.16-26. On Attic and Asian in Cicero, see LEEMAN, *Orationis Ratio*, 91-111, 136-67.

<sup>(13)</sup> Cf. *Orator* 150-52.

<sup>(14)</sup> Cf. *Orator* 168-236.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. *Orator* 135-39.

<sup>(16)</sup> *Orator* 204, 208, 211, 221, etc. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.9; Demetrius, *On Style* 1-35; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.19-22, 122-30.



## I. Stylistic Ornament in 2 Peter

1. *Vocabulary*

One indication that the author of 2 Pet has tried to embellish its vocabulary is that it contains 57 words not found elsewhere in the NT. According to Bauckham, 25 of these words are found in the Septuagint; another 17 are found in other contemporary Jewish literature; and one more is found in the Apostolic Fathers. Thus, these words are not unique in the context of Hellenistic Jewish and early Christian literature. However, most of the remaining fourteen words are very rare <sup>(17)</sup>. These words are: ἀκατάπαστος (2,14), ἀστήρικτος (2,14; 3,16), αὐχμηρός (1,19), ἐκάστοτε (1,15), ἐμπαιγμονή (3,3), ἐξέραμα (2,22), καυσόω (3,10, 12), μυωπάζω (1,9), παραφρονία (2,16), παρεισφέρω (1,5), ροιζηδόν (3,10), στρηιγμός (3,17), ταρταρώ (2,4), and ψευδοδιδάσκαλος (2,1).

Three of these words (ἀκατάπαστος, ἐμπαιγμονή and παραφρονία) are found nowhere else in Greek literature. However, ἀκατάπαστος is probably a mistake for ἀκατάπαυστος which is found elsewhere <sup>(18)</sup>. In addition to the other two words, found nowhere else, two more are found for the first time in 2 Pet — μυωπάζω and ψευδοδιδάσκαλος. These four words are likely to be new coinages, i.e., examples of Cicero's second kind of embellishment of vocabulary. The remaining ten words (including ἀκατάπαυστος) are rare words, i.e., examples of Cicero's first kind of ornamentation of vocabulary. For the most part they do not seem to be archaic. However, ἐκάστοτε, found only in Plato and earlier writers, may be an archaism.

Καυσόω may be used metaphorically in 3,10.12. According to Bauckham, this verb is "elsewhere used only of fever by medical writers" <sup>(19)</sup>. In 2 Pet it is used for the heat that dissolves the universe. This is metaphorical if the author thinks of this heat as a kind of fever that brings about the dissolution of the universe. Watson has identified 25 additional metaphors <sup>(20)</sup>. Watson has also identified the following tropes in 2 Pet: metonymy, antonomasia, synecdoche, hyperbole,

<sup>(17)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 135-36.

<sup>(18)</sup> BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 136.

<sup>(19)</sup> Ibid.

<sup>(20)</sup> In 2 Pet 1,8.9.10.12.13.14 (two metaphors).15; 2,1.2.4.13.14 (two metaphors).15 (four metaphors).17 (two metaphors).18.21; 3,4.14.17 (WATSON, *Invention*, 195-97).

onomatopoeia, periphrasis and epithet<sup>(21)</sup>. These are examples of Cicero's third kind of verbal ornamentation.

Although the author of 2 Pet has used at least ten rare words and four new coinages, he has used at least twenty-seven metaphors as well as a number of other tropes. Thus he is in accord with Cicero's advice to use metaphor and other tropes more frequently than the other two kinds of verbal embellishment. However, he may use rare words more frequently than Cicero recommends. Watson thinks that the eleven metaphors in 2,13-21 constitute too frequent use of metaphors of the same kind, something condemned by Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.14-16)<sup>(22)</sup>.

## 2. Syntax

Cicero does not specify what constitutes a harsh clash of consonants or hiatus of vowels. Quintilian says that for successive words to end and begin with two long vowels, especially when they are the same, and most especially the vowels 'o' and 'a', constitutes the worst problem. But he also says that he is not sure whether too little or too much care to avoid hiatus is the worse (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.33-37). Quintilian says that for successive words to end and begin with 's' or 'x' is jarring (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.37-38).

There seems to be little indication that the author of 2 Pet has made any great effort to avoid these problems. In the first 5 verses of the letter, I count 17 instances of hiatus. However, none of these is an instance of successive words ending and beginning with the long vowels 'o' or 'a.' Likewise the first 5 verses of the letter include no instance of successive words ending and beginning with 's' or 'x'.

### a) Rhythm

With regard to rhythm, Cicero approvingly quotes Aristotle as prohibiting frequent use of iamb (short - long) and tribrach (short - short - short) and recommending primary use of the heroic foot, i.e., the dactyl (long - short - short)<sup>(23)</sup>. Aristotle also especially approves

<sup>(21)</sup> Metonymy in 2 Pet 1,17; 2,14; 3,16, antonomasia in 1,3.19; 2,1, synecdoche in 1,3.11; 2,8.21, hyperbole in 2,14 (twice), onomatopoeia in 3,10, periphrasis in 1,9.12.13 (twice).14.15.17 (twice); 2,14.16; 3,1.7 and epithet in 1,1.2.11; 2,20; 3,18 (WATSON, *Invention*, 195-97).

<sup>(22)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 123-24.

<sup>(23)</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.8. Aristotle speaks of the iamb and the trochee, and these are the words Cicero uses. However, Cicero understands trochee to mean what is commonly called tribrach and so misunderstands Aristotle, who does not

of the paeon (either long - short - short - short, or short - short - short - long), the former kind at the beginning of a sentence, and the latter at the end. Cicero comments that the latter kind of paeon is almost the same as the cretic (long - short - long) (3.182-83). Sentences should end with either the trochee (long - short) or dactyl or either of them alternating with the second kind of paeon or the cretic (3.193).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes the twelve possible two- and three-syllable feet and evaluates each (*On Literary Composition* 17). The pyrrhic (short - short) is not impressive or solemn, while the spondee (long - long) is. The iamb is not ignoble, but the trochee is. The tribrach is a mean foot, but the molossus (long - long - long) is elevated. The amphibrach (short - long - short) is effeminate and ignoble. The anapest (short - short - long) and the dactyl are both very beautiful. The cretic is not ignoble. Both the bacchius (long - long - short) and hypobacchius (short - long - long) have dignity and grandeur.

Quintilian's discussion of rhythm (in *Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.45-120) is less prescriptive. He too describes the twelve possible two- and three-syllable feet (79-82) and argues that each has its proper use in prose (83, 87-89). He says that one should be concerned about no more than the last three feet of a sentence, nor fewer than two (95), and illustrates the effect of using various feet to conclude a sentence (95-111). He notes that Asian writers frequently end a sentence with two trochees (103).

Charles Bigg finds in 2 Pet a "tendency to fall into iambic rhythm"<sup>(24)</sup>. He explains that "many sentences can be turned into tragic senarii with very little alteration"<sup>(25)</sup>. Bigg illustrates this assertion by citing portions of 2 Pet 2,1.3 and 4 that he has altered by omitting or rearranging words. He says that the cadence and color of 1,19 are the same, but does not provide a citation. He says that in the third chapter "there is a perceptible approach to the movement of blank verse"<sup>(26)</sup> and illustrates this by citing portions of 3,10 and 12, in this case without alteration. Finally, Bigg says that 2 Pet 2,22 "falls very

---

use trochee in this sense. Aristotle's heroic foot may include spondee and anapest, as well as dactyl. Cicero summarizes the views of Aristotle somewhat differently, and less accurately, in *Orator* 191-96.

<sup>(24)</sup> BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 227. MAYOR comments on the fine rhythm of sections of 2 Pet, but does not describe the rhythm more precisely except to refer to iambic fragments in 1,19; 2,4.8 and 22 (*St. Jude and St. Peter*, lviii-lix).

<sup>(25)</sup> BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 227. Tragic senarii are lines of poetry consisting of six iambic feet, characteristic of tragedies.

<sup>(26)</sup> *Ibid.*

readily into iambs”<sup>(27)</sup> and cites the παροιμία from the verse in altered form.

However, contrary to Bigg’s suggestion, the unaltered text of 2 Pet is not particularly characterized by iambic rhythm, especially not at the ends of its sentences. Of course, iambic feet are found in 2 Pet, and by my estimate an iambic foot ends a sentence four times<sup>(28)</sup>. However, other rhythms are much more common at the ends of sentences.

The most common foot at the end of the sentences in 2 Pet is the spondee; it is found at the end of eighteen sentences<sup>(29)</sup>. This foot is praised by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Quintilian says that the spondee is best preceded by a cretic (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.97), as it is at the ends of seven of these sentences<sup>(30)</sup>. However, Quintilian says that two spondees should not end a sentence (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.97,101). This is the case nine times in 2 Pet<sup>(31)</sup>; twice this is because the sentence ends with Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (1,11; 3,18a).

The second most common foot at the end of 2 Pet’s sentences is the cretic. It is found eleven times<sup>(32)</sup>. This is in accord with the recommendation of Cicero. This foot is also praised by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Quintilian says that the cretic makes an excellent ending, but disapproves preceding it with a trochee (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.107). This happens four times in 2 Pet<sup>(33)</sup>.

The third most common foot at the end of 2 Pet’s sentences is the trochee, found seven times<sup>(34)</sup>. This also accords with the recommendation of Cicero, but Dionysius of Halicarnassus says this foot is ignoble. Quintilian approves having two trochees end a sentence (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.103). This happens three times in 2 Pet (i.e., 1,16.17; 2,15).

2 Pet’s sentences also end with paeon (1,10b; 2,16a and b) and dactyl (3,6). As noted above, Cicero commends both; Dionysius of Halicarnassus commends the dactyl. Quintilian approves ending with a dactyl (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.104), but not a paeon (ibid., 110-11). Cicero thinks the first kind of paeon should be used at the beginning of

<sup>(27)</sup> BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 228.

<sup>(28)</sup> At the ends of 2 Pet 1,7.18.20; 3,4b.

<sup>(29)</sup> At the ends of 2 Pet 1,2.10a.11.12.14.15.21; 2,3.17.19b.20; 3,4a.7.9.13.14.16.18a.

<sup>(30)</sup> 2 Pet 1,2.12; 2,17.19b; 3,4a.14.16.

<sup>(31)</sup> I.e., at the end of 2 Pet 1,10a.11.14.15.21; 2,3; 3,7.9.18a.

<sup>(32)</sup> At the ends of 2 Pet 1,9; 2,2.11.14.19a.21.22; 3,8.10.12.17.

<sup>(33)</sup> I.e., at the ends of 2 Pet 1,9; 2,19a; 3,8.10.

<sup>(34)</sup> At the ends of 2 Pet 1,8.16.17; 2,1.10a.15; 3,18b.

a sentence (cf. also Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.111); however, it is used at the end of 2 Pet 1,10b. Quintilian cautions that he does not recommend too great attention to rhythm (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.112-16; cf. Cicero, *De oratore* 3.193).

#### b) Figures of speech and thought

We earlier noted that 2 Pet frequently repeats words. Often words are repeated in close proximity, producing the figures of speech called paronomasia and transplacement, which are included among the figures mentioned by Cicero (*De oratore* 3.206) and Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.3.41-44, 66-74) as means of ornamentation<sup>(35)</sup>. Watson has identified many instances of transplacement<sup>(36)</sup> and paronomasia<sup>(37)</sup>. To Watson's list we can add several additional transplacements<sup>(38)</sup>.

<sup>(35)</sup> Cf. *Ad Herennium* 4.20, 29-31.

<sup>(36)</sup> 2 Pet 1,3-4 δεδωρημένης - δεδώρηται, 1,5-7 the word for each virtue (except the first and last) is repeated, 1,10 ποιείσθαι - ποιούντες, 1,13-14 σκηνώματι - σκηνώματος, 1,17 δόξαν - δόξης, 1,17-18 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης - φωνῇ ... ἐνεχθείσαν, 1,21 ἡνέχθη - φερόμενοι cf. use of same verb in vv. 17-18; 2,1 παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας - ἐπάγοντες ... ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν, 2,1-3 repetition of ἀπώλεια (?), 2,5-6 ἀσεβῶν - ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν, 2,7-9 δίκαιον - ἐρρύσατο, δίκαιος - ἡμέραν - ἡμέρας - δικαίαν, ῥύεσθαι - ἀδίκους, 2,10-12 βλασφημοῦντες - βλάσφημον - βλασφημοῦντες, 2,12 φθοράν - φθορᾶ - φθαρῇσονται, 2,13 ἀδικούμενοι - ἀδικίας, 2,15 ὁδὸν - ὁδῶ (?), 2,16-18 φθεγξάμενον - φθεγγόμενοι (?), 2,21 ἐπεγνωκέναι - ἐπιγνοῦσιν; 3,5-7 οὐρανοὶ - γῆ - ὕδατος - ὕδατος - λόγῳ, ὕδατι - ἀπώλετο, οὐρανοὶ - γῆ - λόγῳ - ἀπωλείας, 3,10-12 λυθήσεται - λυομένων - λυθήσονται, 3,12-14 προσδοκῶντας - προσδοκῶμεν - προσδοκῶντες (WATSON, *Invention*, 195-97). On page 195 Watson indicates a transplacement in 1,18 that does not seem to be there.

<sup>(37)</sup> 2 Pet 1,10 ποιείσθαι - ποιούντες, 1,12-15 ὑπομνήσκειν - ὑπομνήσει - μνήμην ποιείσθαι, 1,16-17 μεγαλειότητος - μεγαλοπρεποῦς, 1,19-21 προφητικὸν - προφητεία (?); 2,1 ψευδοπροφήται - ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι and παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας - ἐπάγοντες ... ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν, 2,6-7 κατακλυσμὸν - [καταστροφῇ] - κατέκρινεν - καταπονούμενον ... ἀναστροφῆς and ἀσεβέ[σ]ιν - ἀθέσμων - ἀσελγεία, 2,8-9 δίκαιος - ἀδίκους, 2,12 φθοράν - φθορᾶ - φθαρῇσονται, 2,13 τρυφῇ - ἐντρυφῶντες, 2,16 παρανομίας - παραφρονίαν and ἄφωνον - φωνῇ, 2,19 δοῦλοι - δεδοῦλῳται; 3,1-2 ὑπομνήσει - μνησθῆναι, 3,2 προειρημένων ῥημάτων (?), 3,3 ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαίκεται, 3,9 βραδύνει - βραδύτητα, 3,16-17 ἀστήρικτοι - στηριγμοῦ (WATSON, *Invention*, 195-97). On pages 114 and 196 he speaks of paronomasia in 2,6-7 as including the word κατακλυσμὸν, but this word is found in 2,5.

<sup>(38)</sup> 2 Pet 1,2-3 ἐπιγνώσει - ἐπιγνώσεως, 1,3-4 repetition of θείας, 1,3-5 ἀρετῇ - ἀρετὴν, 1,12-14 εἰδότας - εἰδώς; 2,4-5 repetition of οὐκ ἐφείσατο, 2,9-11 κρίσεως - κρίσιν; 3,7-8 ἡμέραν - μία ἡμέρα - ἡμέρα μία, 3,10-13 ἡμέρα - οὐρανοὶ - στοιχεῖα ... καυσούμενα - γῆ - ἡμέρας - οὐρανοὶ - στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα - οὐρανούς - γῆν.

Other instances of repetition of words in 2 Pet are a means of developing certain topics. Watson has discussed the development of many of these topics, including: righteousness; knowledge; power; piety; glory; promises; escaping corruption; desire; eagerness; the reminder topic; being established; the metaphor of the day; eschatological destruction; the way; and keeping<sup>(39)</sup>.

2 Pet also develops topics not discussed by Watson. The παρουσία topic is introduced in 1,16 and developed in 3,4 and 12. The topic of holiness (ἅγιος) is introduced in 1,18 and developed in several passages<sup>(40)</sup>. The related topics of prophecy (προφητεία) and scripture (γραφή) are introduced in 1,20. The former is developed in 1,21; 2,16 and 3,2, the latter in 3,16.

The development of some of these topics constitutes inclusio, i.e., the repetition at the end of a section, of a word or phrase used at its beginning. Thus the topic of knowledge is mentioned in 1,2 and 3,18, and the topic of glory is mentioned in 1,3 and 3,18. In addition, grace (χάρις) is mentioned in 1,2 and 3,18; and peace (εἰρήνη) is mentioned in 1,2 and 3,14. All of these serve to end the letter by returning to items

<sup>(39)</sup> According to Watson, the topic of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) is introduced in 1,1 and further developed in 2,5.7.8.9.15.21; 3,13. Likewise the topic of knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις) is introduced in 1,2 and developed in 1,3.5.6.8.9.12.16.20; 2,12.20.21; 3,5.8.16.18. The topic of power (δύναμις) is introduced in 1,3 and developed in 1,16; 2,11. The topic of piety (εὐσέβεια) is introduced in 1,3.6.7 and developed in 2,5.6.9.13; 3,7.11.14. The topic of glory (δόξα) is introduced in 1,3 and developed in 1,17; and 3,18. The topic of promises (ἐπαγγέλματα) is introduced in 1,4 and developed in 2,19; 3,4.9.13. The topic of escaping corruption (ἀποφυγόντες φθορά) is also introduced in 1,4 and developed in 1,9; 2,12.18-22. The topic of desire (ἐπιθυμία) is introduced in 1,4 and developed in 2,10.18 and 3,3. The topic of eagerness (σπουδή) is introduced in 1,5 and developed in 1,10 and 3,14. The reminder topic occurs three times in 1,12-15 and is repeated in 3,1-2. The topic of being established (στηρίζω) is introduced in 1,12 and developed in 2,14; 3,16.17. The metaphor of the day (ἡμέρα) is first used in 1,19 and then used again in 3,7.10.12 and 18. The topic of eschatological destruction is introduced in 2,1 and developed in 2,3.12; 3,6.7.9.16. The topic of the way (ὁδός) is discussed in 2,2.15.21. The topic of keeping is found in 2,4.9.17 and 3,7 (WATSON, *Invention*, 192-93. This is Watson's summary of topics in 2 Pet; he also discusses most of them earlier as he analyzes the letter.) The topic of knowledge is also developed in several other passages not mentioned by Watson, i.e., 2 Pet 1,14; 2,9; 3,3. Watson does not mention the presence of the topic of glory in 2,10, eagerness in 1,15, or use of the day metaphor in 2,9; however, he does list 3,3 and 8 where "day" is not used metaphorically. The topic of being established might be seen as introduced in 1,10, rather than 1,12, and also developed in 1,19.

<sup>(40)</sup> 2 Pet 1,21; 2,21; 3,2 and 11.

mentioned at the beginning. On a smaller scale, supplying abundantly (ἐπιχορηγέω) is mentioned in 1,5 and 11, tying that section together.

Thus most repetition of words in 2 Pet can be seen as an effort to produce the artistic and other effects described above<sup>(41)</sup>. Watson has catalogued many other figures of speech and thought that serve to ornament 2 Pet<sup>(42)</sup>.

### c) Sentence structure

Many of the sentences of 2 Pet are relatively short and simple. However, 2 Pet also contains several long, complex sentences<sup>(43)</sup>. These are instances in which the periodic style is used for ornament<sup>(44)</sup>.

The first and most elaborate of these periods is 1,3-7. This is a complex sentence, of which vv. 3-4 form the protasis and vv. 5-7 the apodosis<sup>(45)</sup>. VV. 3-4 are a genitive absolute introduced by ὥς, on which depend a relative clause and a purpose clause. The main verb of vv. 5-7 is an imperative. If vv. 5-7 are taken as a single clause, the sentence consists of four clauses, which is the maximum length of a period according to Demetrius<sup>(46)</sup>. The last clause is also the longest, as Demetrius recommends (*On Style* 18). This period forms the introduction to the message of 2 Pet, a good place to use a period according to Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.128). This sentence is not only grammatically complex; it is also ornamented with many figures of speech and thought. According to Watson, vv. 3-4 exhibit two figures of speech in addition to the tropes and transplacement already noted above — personification and hendiadys<sup>(47)</sup>. VV. 5-7 constitute the figure of speech called climax and also exhibit the

<sup>(41)</sup> Contra BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 137: “often there seems to be no literary intention in the repetition”.

<sup>(42)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 97-99, 100, 103, 104-105, 107-109, 114, 115-24, 132-35, 195-97. A number of these are listed in the following sections of this paper.

<sup>(43)</sup> Cicero recommends such use of different sentence types in *Orator* 211; cf. also Demetrius, *On Style* 15.

<sup>(44)</sup> *Ad Herennium* lists the period among the figures of speech that can be used for ornament (4.27).

<sup>(45)</sup> For this analysis see REICKE, *James, Peter and Jude*, 152; F.W. DANKER, “2 Peter 1: A Solemn Decree”, *CBQ* 40 (1978) 64-82; and most recently J.M. STARR, *Sharers in Divine Nature. 2 Peter 1:4 in Its Hellenistic Context* (CB.NT 33; Stockholm 2000) 24-26. BIGG, *St. Peter and St. Jude*, 253, KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 299 and GERDMAR, *Rethinking*, 33, disagree.

<sup>(46)</sup> Demetrius, *On Style* 16. Quintilian says that an average number of clauses in a period is four, but that it often allows more (*Institutio Oratoria* 9.4.125).

<sup>(47)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 97-98; on p. 195 he adds polyptoton.

following figures of speech in addition to transplacement: homoeoptoton, isocolon, polysyndeton, and reduplication<sup>(48)</sup>.

Another somewhat elaborate sentence is found in 2 Pet 1,19-20. The main clause is v. 19a. On this depends a relative clause (v. 19b). A temporal clause (v. 19c) depends on the relative clause, as does a participial phrase (v. 19d-20a). A noun clause (v. 20b) depends on the participial phrase. Like 1,3-7, 1,19-20 consists of four clauses, of which the last is the longest. Once again the sentence is not only grammatically complex, but also exhibits many tropes and figures. In addition to the antonomasia and paronomasia already noted, in this passage we find a striking similitude, likening the prophetic word to a lamp shining in a dark place. We also find a metaphor in which the παρουσία of Jesus is presented as the dawn of day and rising of the morning star. Use of the latter two terms for one reality constitutes hendiadys. This passage also exhibits antithesis<sup>(49)</sup>.

After 1,3-7 the most polished sentence in 2 Pet is 2,4-10a. This is another conditional sentence, of which vv. 4-8 form the protasis and vv. 9-10a the apodosis<sup>(50)</sup>. VV. 4-7 consist of three parallel conditional clauses; the last is followed by a parenthetical explanatory clause in v. 8. The first two conditional clauses, in vv. 4 and 5, each have two main verbs coordinated by ἀλλά. The third conditional clause, in vv. 6-7, also has two main verbs coordinated by καί. The second and third conditional clauses are linked to the first with καί. In vv. 9-10a two infinitives depend on the main verb; the object of the second infinitive is modified by two participial phrases. If the parenthetical clause in v. 8 is not counted, 2,4-10a consists of four clauses, of which the last is the longest. Each of the four clauses presents an antithesis, something especially appropriate for a period<sup>(51)</sup>. In addition to the tropes, transplacement and paronomasia already noted, this passage exhibits epiphora, homoeoptoton, regressio, polyptoton (4), antithesis (3), adjunction (2), and parenthesis<sup>(52)</sup>.

Another elaborate sentence is found in 2,12-14. The subject is οἱ; the verb is φθαρῆσονται. The subject is modified by one participial phrase in v. 12, and by two more in v. 13a. A relative clause

<sup>(48)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 98. Gerdmar is critical of Watson's identification of figures of speech in 1,4-5 and elsewhere (*Rethinking*, 99 n 35).

<sup>(49)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 104-105; on p. 195 he adds ellipsis.

<sup>(50)</sup> GERDMAR sees 2,4-7 as a protasis that lacks an apodosis (*Rethinking*, 33).

<sup>(51)</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.9.7-8; Demetrius, *On Style* 22-24.

<sup>(52)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 196.



depends on the first of these three. In v. 13b-14 two nouns in apposition to the subject are modified by five more participial phrases. V. 14 ends with a phrase in apposition to the subject. This period consists of two clauses. In it we find, in addition to tropes, paronomasia and transplacement: another similitude, asyndeton, ellipsis, polyptoton, regressio, homoeopropheron, irony, emphasis (2), and exclamation<sup>(53)</sup>.

3,1-4a is another elaborate sentence. The main clause is 3,1a. A relative clause (3,1b) depends on it, and an infinitive phrase (3,2) depends on the relative clause. In 3,3a a participial phrase, modifying the vocative ἀγαπητοί in 3,1<sup>(54)</sup>, introduces a noun clause (3,3b), whose subject ἐμπόικται is modified by two participles, the second of which introduces a direct quotation in 3,4a. This period consists of four clauses. In addition to tropes, paronomasia and transplacement, 3,1-4a exhibits aphodos, transitio, ellipsis (2), irony, pleonasm, dialogue and rhetorical question<sup>(55)</sup>.

## II. The Grand Style

Especially the ornamentation of 2 Pet probably makes it an example of the full or grand style<sup>(56)</sup>. Watson draws upon a number of sources to describe the grand style as follows:

The Grand Style is a "smooth and ornate arrangement of impressive words" and is characterized by a "power of thought and majesty of diction." It is forceful, yet stately and opulent. It is the most ornamented style, using the most ornate words available and all figures of speech and thought, particularly hyperbole. Amplification is found throughout<sup>(57)</sup>.

This description applies to 2 Pet in every respect except that 2 Pet does not make much use of hyperbole. Watson identifies only two instances, both in 2,14. Nevertheless, the other correspondences between this description and 2 Pet strongly indicate that 2 Pet was written in the grand style.

<sup>(53)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 196.

<sup>(54)</sup> MAYOR (*St. Jude and St. Peter*, liv-lv) analyzes 3,2 as an accusative-infinitive construction, and the participle in 3,3a as modifying the implied subject. On this analysis the case of the participle is wrong, nominative instead of accusative. GERDMAR agrees (*Rethinking*, 34-35).

<sup>(55)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 196.

<sup>(56)</sup> So WATSON, *Invention*, 144.

<sup>(57)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 24-25, references omitted. On the grand style in *Ad Herennium* see LEEMAN, *Orationis Ratio*, 29-32; on the grand style in Cicero see pp. 145-49.

The most extensive discussion of the grand style is found in Demetrius, *On Style* 38-124; he calls it the elevated (μεγαλοπρεπής) style. According to Demetrius, elevation comes from thought, vocabulary and syntax.

With regard to vocabulary, Demetrius says that elevation results from the use of unusual words (77), new coinages (95-98), including compound words (91-93) and onomatopoeia (94), and metaphors (78-90) and other tropes, especially epithet, which may be combined with metaphor (85), and allegory (99-102). Poetic vocabulary adds elevation (112-13).

With regard to syntax, Demetrius says that hiatus should neither be ignored, nor avoided completely. Hiatus, especially between the same long vowels and diphthongs, produces grandeur (68-74). Although Aristotle does not discuss full, plain and middle styles, Demetrius seems to understand Aristotle as describing the full or elevated style. Therefore, Demetrius regards Aristotle's comments on rhythm as referring to the elevated style. Thus use of the paeon is elevated, but heroic rhythm (i.e., dactyl, spondee, and possibly anapest) is too solemn<sup>(58)</sup>, and the iamb too ordinary (38-43). Demetrius identifies the following figures of speech as appropriate to the elevated style: repetition (59, 61, 66, 103), anthypallage, or substitution of one grammatical case for another (60), asyndeton, though polysyndeton can also increase elevation (61-63, 54-58), variety in the use of cases (65). Crowding figures together should be avoided (67). Long clauses produce grandeur (44), as does composition in periods (45-47). Other syntactical features that produce elevation are: a series of ugly sounds (48-49, 105), putting less vivid words before the more vivid (50-52), not having connectives correspond too precisely (53), aposiopesis (103), indirect construction (104), and use of the epiphoneme (106-11).

The faulty style corresponding to the elevated is the frigid. It arises particularly from speaking too grandly of small things (119-23). Hyperbole is the most frigid of all figures (124-27).

To a considerable extent, Demetrius' description of the grand style resembles Cicero's description of stylistic ornament in general. We have already observed that the style of 2 Pet largely conforms to the latter. However, Demetrius adds some items. Demetrius says that the new coinages that produce elevation include compound words and onomatopoeia. All four of 2 Pet's new coinages are compound words. None is an example of onomatopoeia, but one of 2 Pet's rare words is,

<sup>(58)</sup> This does not seem to be Aristotle's view in *Rhetoric* 3.8.

i.e., ροιζηδόν. According to Demetrius allegory produces elevation, but there is no allegory in 2 Pet. F. H. Chase and Richard J. Bauckham describe the vocabulary of 2 Pet as poetic<sup>(59)</sup>.

Of the figures of speech Demetrius says are appropriate to the elevated style, various kinds of repetition are particularly characteristic of 2 Pet, as we have seen. Watson has detected asyndeton in 2 Pet 2,10 and 12-15, and polysyndeton in 2 Pet 1,5-7<sup>(60)</sup>. And, as we have seen, 2 Pet does have a number of complex sentences. We may see instances of putting the less vivid word before the more vivid in 2 Pet 1,9 and 19. Τυφλός is less vivid than μυωπάζων (1,9); ἡμέρα διανυγάζει is less vivid than φωσφόρος ἀνατείλει (1,19). The other syntactical elements that Demetrius thinks produce elevation do not seem to occur in 2 Pet. 2 Pet's subject matter is not too mundane for appropriate use of the elevated style, and its limited use of hyperbole is consistent with avoidance of frigidity.

"Longinus", *On the Sublime* can also be seen as a discussion of the grand style, which the author calls the sublime (ὑψος). According to the author, sublimity comes from great thoughts, strong emotion, certain figures of thought and speech, noble diction and dignified word arrangement (8). Noble diction consists of metaphors (32) and other tropes, including hyperbole (38). Use of trivial words should be avoided (43).

Dignified word arrangement makes use of dactyls (39); the pyrrhic, tribrach, and combination of two trochees all detract from sublimity (41)<sup>(61)</sup>. Composition in periods, rather than short sentences produces sublimity (40, 42). Figures of thought and speech that produce sublimity are: adjuration (16), rhetorical question and answer (18), asyndeton (19), combination of figures, e.g., asyndeton combined with repetition and vivid presentation (20-21), hyperbaton (22), polyptoton (23-24), historical present (25), change of person (26-27) and periphrasis (28-29).

The diction of 2 Pet is in line with "Longinus" description of noble diction. With regard to rhythm, 2 Pet departs from "Longinus" prescriptions mainly by making use of the combination of two trochees. We have already noted that 2 Pet includes some complex sentences and uses some of the figures "Longinus" says produce

<sup>(59)</sup> CHASE, "Peter, Second Epistle of", 808; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 136.

<sup>(60)</sup> WATSON, *Invention*, 195-97.

<sup>(61)</sup> In this passage, as in Cicero, the tribrach is called the trochee, and the combination of two trochees is called the dichoree.

sublimity, namely, asyndeton and repetition, as well as the trope periphrasis. Watson has also noted rhetorical question in 3,4, and polyptoton in many passages <sup>(62)</sup>.

### III. Asian Style

More often than 2 Pet has been identified as an example of the grand style, it has been identified as an example of Asian rhetoric <sup>(63)</sup>. The relationship between the two typologies of style, grand - middle - plain, and Attic - Asian - Rhodian is not clear. It is tempting to see them alternative names for the same thing: grand = Asian, middle = Rhodian, plain = Attic. However, since Cicero and Quintilian discuss both, but do not relate them in this way, there is little basis for this equation of the two. Most likely there are Attic, Asian and Rhodian versions of each of the grand, middle and plain styles.

Unfortunately few examples of Asian style survive, and our understanding of it mainly derives from somewhat critical references to it. Following Cicero (in *Brutus* 325), Eduard Norden distinguished two kinds of Asianism — the refined and the bombastic. Norden presents Hegesias of Magnesia as an example of the former. His style was characterized by 1) replacement of the period with short, choppy sentences; 2) each of which had a marked rhythm; and 3) unusual usage, e.g., nonsensical metaphors and absurd paraphrases (cf. Cicero, *Orator* 230-31). Norden presents the Nemrud-Dagh inscription as an

<sup>(62)</sup> 2 Pet 1,4.10.13.14.17.18.21; 2,1.5.6.7.8.9.12.15; 3,5.6.7.10-12.12-14 (WATSON, *Invention*, 195-97).

<sup>(63)</sup> REICKE, James, *Peter and Jude*, 146-47; GREEN, *Second Epistle General of Peter*, 18, 41; KELLY, *Peter and Jude*, 228; BAUCKHAM, *Jude, 2 Peter*, 137; WATSON, *Invention*, 145-46; THURÉN, "Style", 340. GERDMAR contests this (*Rethinking*, 60-62). MOULTON describes 2 Pet as Attic (J.H. MOULTON – W.F. HOWARD, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* [Edinburgh 1920] II, 5-6, 27-28), but by this he means that it is written in an "artificial literary dialect" (p. 5), not that it is Attic as opposed to Asian. The contrast between Asian and Attic styles seems to have arisen at Rome, see U. v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, "Asianismus und Atticismus", *Rhetorika*. Schriften zur aristotelischen und hellenistischen Rhetorik (ed. R. STARK) (Hildesheim 1968 [originally 1900]); RUSSELL, *Criticism in Antiquity*, 48-50; J. WISSE, "Greeks, Romans and the Rise of Atticism", *Greek Literary Theory After Aristotle*. A Collection of Papers in Honor of D.M. Schenkeveld (ed. J.G.J. ABBENES *et al.*) (Amsterdam 1995) 64-82; S. SWAIN, *Hellenism and Empire*. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250 (Oxford 1996) 22-26, 39. However, the style labeled "Asian" by Roman authors was widespread.

example of the bombastic style. It shared the second and third characteristics with the refined Asian style, but used long instead of short sentences. Norden describes the style of the inscription as passionately elevated, making use of highly poetic words and new coinages, avoiding hiatus, freely altering word order for the sake of rhythm, and making use of stilted, bombastic and refined expression<sup>(64)</sup>. These two kinds of Asianism can be seen as the middle and grand Asian styles.

H. J. Rose describes Asianism as follows, apparently referring mainly to the first, the middle Asian style:

It would seem to have abandoned the use of the period to a considerable extent and made up its compositions mostly of short sentences, ending with a marked, almost a versified rhythm. The wording was often very artificial, and on occasion normal word-order... was sacrificed and even meaningless words inserted to get the desired sound-effects. The Georgian figures seem also, from the specimens we have, to have been used to excess, and poetical ornaments to have abounded<sup>(65)</sup>.

Bo Reicke describes Asianism as “characterized by a loaded, verbose, high-sounding manner of expression leaning toward the novel and bizarre, and careless about violating classic ideals of simplicity”<sup>(66)</sup>; he is apparently referring mainly to the second, grand Asian style. 2 Pet is an example of this kind of Asian style<sup>(67)</sup>.

#### IV. 2 Peter and the Nemrud Dagħ Inscription

If we take the Nemrud-Dagħ inscription as typical of this style, the similarities between it and 2 Pet confirm that 2 Pet is written in the grand Asian style. Of course, the two are different as well as similar<sup>(68)</sup>. The style of the inscription has been studied most

<sup>(64)</sup> E. NORDEN, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Stuttgart 1958 [originally 1898]) I, 134-47. On Cicero and Asianism see LEEMAN, *Orationis Ratio*, 91-111. Leeman discusses *Brutus* 325 on pages 94-95.

<sup>(65)</sup> H.J. ROSE, *Outlines of Classical Literature* (Cleveland – New York 1959) 146.

<sup>(66)</sup> REICKE, *James, Peter and Jude*, 147.

<sup>(67)</sup> L. THURÉN also sees 2 Pet as exhibiting grand Asian style (“The General New Testament Writings”, *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric*, 600).

<sup>(68)</sup> REICKE (*James, Peter and Jude*, 184) and GREEN (*Second Epistle General of Peter*, 18) mention that there are similarities, but do not describe them in detail. Gerdmar (*Rethinking*, 62) denies that the inscription and 2 Pet are similar.

thoroughly by Joseph Waldis<sup>(69)</sup>. His work is basic to the following discussion.

### 1. Vocabulary

They are similar in vocabulary. The inscription does not seem to use as many rare words as does 2 Pet, but it contains more new coinages. Waldis lists six — ἀνελιάτος in sentences 14 and 25, ἐνθρόνισμα in sentence 5, ἐπίθυσις in sentence 18, ἱεροθέσιον in sentences 5 and 17, μεταδιατάττω in sentence 23, and προσκαθοσιόω in sentence 11<sup>(70)</sup>. To this can be added ὀπισθοβαρής in sentence 15 and ὑπολήνιος in sentence 19, for a total of eight new coinages. As we have seen above, 2 Pet contains four. The inscription uses somewhat more metaphors than 2 Pet. Waldis lists 33 metaphors in the inscription<sup>(71)</sup>; as we have seen above 2 Pet uses 27. Waldis also identifies the following tropes in the inscription: metonymy (in sentences 7 and 17), hyperbole (in sentence 5), periphrasis<sup>(72)</sup> and synecdoche (in sentence 5). As is true of 2 Pet, the most common trope in the inscription, after metaphor, is periphrasis. Waldis notes that this is characteristic of Asian style<sup>(73)</sup>.

### 2. Syntax

The inscription makes efforts to avoid hiatus<sup>(74)</sup>; as was noted above, 2 Pet does not seem to do so. In the opening lines of the inscription (i.e., sentences 1-3), hiatus occurs 5 times. In the opening lines of 2 Pet (i.e., 1,1-5) hiatus occurs 17 times.

#### a) Rhythm

The rhythm of the two texts is similar, though there are differences between them. As is true for 2 Pet, the most common foot at the end of

<sup>(69)</sup> J. WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil der grossen griechischen Inschrift vom Nemrud-Dagh in Kommagene (Nordsyrien)*. Ein Beitrag zur Koine-Forschung (Heidelberg 1920). References to the inscription make use of Waldis's division of it into sentences on pp. 3-11.

<sup>(70)</sup> WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil*, 27.

<sup>(71)</sup> In sentences 1, 2 (four metaphors), 3 (three metaphors), 4 (two metaphors), 5 (five metaphors), 6, 7 (four metaphors), 10, 14 (three metaphors), 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 25 (two metaphors), 26 and 27 (WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil*, 65-66).

<sup>(72)</sup> In sentences 1, 2, 4 (twice), 5 (five times), 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 17, 18, 19 (three times), 22 (twice), 23, 25 and 26.

<sup>(73)</sup> WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil*, 66.

<sup>(74)</sup> WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil*, 62-63.

sentences in the inscription is the spondee; it is found at the end of eleven sentences<sup>(75)</sup>. Also like 2 Pet, four times the spondee is preceded by a cretic<sup>(76)</sup>. Unlike 2 Pet, the sentences of the inscription do not frequently end with two spondees; this happens only at the end of sentence 21.

Unlike 2 Pet, the second most common foot at the end of the inscription's sentences is not the cretic. It is found only twice, at the ends of sentences 6 and 17. In the latter case it is preceded by a trochee.

The second most common foot at the end of the inscription's sentences is the trochee, the third most common foot at the end of 2 Pet's sentences. A trochee is found at the end of nine of the inscription's sentences<sup>(77)</sup>. Two trochees end a sentence five of these times<sup>(78)</sup>.

Like 2 Pet, the inscription's sentences also end with iambs (at the end of sentence 4), dactyls (at the ends of 1, 5, 12) and paeans (at the end of 26). The last is of the kind best used at the end of a sentence.

According to Waldis, Asian style allowed four possible sentence endings<sup>(79)</sup>:

1. Cretic - trochee/spondee, which may also take the forms paean - trochee/spondee, molossus (long - long - long) - cretic, and paean - trochee - iamb, among others. Twelve of the inscription's sentences end in one of these ways<sup>(80)</sup>.

2. Cretic - cretic/dactyl, which may also take the forms cretic - paean and paean - cretic, among others. Four of the inscription's sentences end in one of these ways<sup>(81)</sup>.

3. Trochee - trochee, which may also take the form trochee - spondee. Eight of the inscription's sentences end in one of these ways<sup>(82)</sup>.

4. Cretic - iamb. One of the inscription's sentences ends this way, namely 17.

<sup>(75)</sup> At the ends of sentences 3, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25.

<sup>(76)</sup> In sentences 3, 10, 14, 19.

<sup>(77)</sup> At the ends of sentences 2, 7, 8, 13, 16, 20, 22, 23, 27.

<sup>(78)</sup> In sentences 8, 20, 22, 23, 27.

<sup>(79)</sup> WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil*, 58-60.

<sup>(80)</sup> Sentences 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21. Although Waldis does not include them in this category, it seems that sentences 10 and 18 also belong here. If these sentences are included, Waldis's four categories include all of the inscription's sentences.

<sup>(81)</sup> Sentences 1, 5, 6, 26.

<sup>(82)</sup> Sentences 8, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27.

Sixteen of 2 Pet's sentences end in the first of the ways listed above<sup>(83)</sup>. Fourteen of 2 Pet's sentences end in the third way listed above<sup>(84)</sup>. None of 2 Pet's sentences ends in the second or fourth ways listed above; these are also less frequent in the inscription than the first and third sentence endings. While all of the inscription's sentences end in one of these four ways, fifteen of the sentences in 2 Pet end in some way other than these four.

#### b) Figures of speech and thought

Both 2 Pet and the inscription repeat words frequently. Both texts repeat about 38% of the words in their vocabulary<sup>(85)</sup>. As we have seen, 2 Pet often repeats words for artistic effect. This is also the case for the inscription. As in 2 Pet, the inscription's repetition of words can often be seen as transplacement<sup>(86)</sup> or paronomasia<sup>(87)</sup>.

Also as in 2 Pet, other instances of repetition of words in the inscription can be seen as developing certain topics. Such topics include: being just; piety; establishing; sanctification; race; being

<sup>(83)</sup> 2 Pet 1,2.7.8.12.20; 2,1.10a.17.19b.20.21; 3,4a and b.14.16.17. Other forms of this sentence ending that are found in 2 Pet are cretic - trochee - iamb, trochee - iamb - spondee, and trochee - iamb - cretic.

<sup>(84)</sup> 2 Pet 1,10a.11.14.15.16.17.21; 2,3.15; 3,7.9.13.18a and b. Other forms of this sentence ending that are found in 2 Pet are spondee - spondee and spondee - trochee.

<sup>(85)</sup> 2 Pet repeats 151 of a total vocabulary of 401 words; the inscription repeats 165 of a total of 436. Since the total number of different words in the inscription is somewhat larger than in 2 Pet, although the latter is slightly longer than the former, we can see that 2 Pet repeats its words somewhat more frequently than does the inscription.

<sup>(86)</sup> Sentence 1 βασιλεὺς - βασιλέως, ἐπιφανής - ἐπιφανοῦς, repetition of καλλινίκου; 2-3 μακαριστῆς ... βίον - βίου μακαριστῶς; 4 κοινήν - κοινόν; 5 οὐρανίων ... θρόνων - οὐρανίους ... θρόνους, ὑπάρξαν - ὑπάρχη; 5-6 repetition of ὁρᾶς, καθιδρυμένος - καθιδρυσάμην; 8-9 πρεπούσας - πρέπουσαν, θυσίων - θυσίας; 11-12 θυσίων πλήθους - πλήθος ... θυσίας; 14 repetition of τηρεῖν, ἰδίας - ἰδίαι, καθοσιώσας - καθοσιωμένων, ἀσύλοις - ἄσυλον; 14-15 ἀσέβειαν - ἀσεβείας; 14-16 νόμον - νόμος - νόμον; 16-17 repetition of θεῶν; 17 repetition of ἱεροθεσίῳ; 17-18 κόσμον - κόσμον; 18 πᾶν - πάντας, χάρις - χάρις, τιμαῖς - τιμὰς; 18-19 ἱερᾶς - ἱερὰς; 20-21 repetition of καθεύρωσα; 21 συνόδοις - σύνοδος; 23 κόμας ... δαίμοσιν - κόμας ... δαιμόνων; 24-25 τιμῆς - τιμὴν; 25 ἀπάντων - ἅπαντας; 25-26 θεῶν - θεοῖς, γένει - γένους; 26 πολλῶν - πολλὰ; 26-27 εἰλεως ... πᾶσαν - ἔλεως ... πάντας ... πάντα; 27 τιμὰς - τιμῆς, δαίμονας ... θεοὺς - δαιμόνων ... θεῶν.

<sup>(87)</sup> Sentence 1 βασιλεὺς - βασιλίσσης, φιλοράμοις - φιλέλλην - φιλαδέλφου - φιλομήτορος, θεὸς - θεᾶς; 18 καθεύρωσα - καθοσιώσας; 21 καθεύρωσα - καθοσιώθη, ἀφείσθωσαν - προσκαρτερεῖτωσαν - ποιείσθωσαν; 26 προγόνοις - ἐκγόνοις - γένους - συγγενεῖς, ἅπαντας - πᾶσαν.



common; honor; favor; time; and law<sup>(88)</sup>. Note that several of these have counterparts in 2 Pet, namely, being just; piety; establishing; sanctification; and favor.

As is the case in 2 Pet, the development of some of these topics in the inscription constitutes *inclusio*. The topic of sanctification is mentioned in sentences 1 and 26, as are the topics of favor and time. The topic of piety is mentioned in sentences 2 and 26. The topic of race is mentioned in 4 and 26; the topics of honor and law are mentioned in 4 and 27.

Waldis lists other figures in the inscription on pages 67-71.

### c) Sentence structure

One of the most obvious ways the inscription and 2 Pet differ is in the average length, and thus complexity, of their sentences. The two texts are approximately equal in length: 2 Pet contains 1103 words; the inscription consists of 1065 words. However, I count 44 sentences in 2 Pet, and Waldis counts 27 in the inscription. Both texts include both long and short sentences, but average sentence length in 2 Pet is approximately 25 words, while average sentence length in the inscription is approximately 39 words. In this respect 2 Pet is less grand than the inscription and may be seen as falling between the grand and middle Asian styles<sup>(89)</sup>.

One of the inscription's elaborate sentences is sentence 5. This is a

<sup>(88)</sup> The topic of being just (δίκαιος) is introduced in sentence 1 and developed in 4, 7 and 25. The topic of piety (εὐσέβεια, εὐσεβής) is introduced in sentence 2 and developed in 4, 5, 14, 18, 22 and 26. Impiety (ἀσέβεια) is mentioned in 14 and 15. The topic of establishing (ἀνατίθημι, καθίστημι) is introduced in sentence 5 and developed in 8 (twice), 10, 14, 17, 22 and 23. The topic of sanctification (καθιδρύω, καθιερώνω, καθοσιώω, προσκαθιστώω) is introduced in sentence 1 and developed in 5 (twice), 6, 11, 14 (twice), 17, 18 (twice), 20, 21 (twice) and 23. Being holy (ἅγιος, ὅσιος) is mentioned in 5, 15, 22, 23 and 26; holiness (ὁσιότης) is mentioned in 2. The topic of race (γένος, ἔκγονος, πρόγονος, γενεά, συγγενής) is introduced in sentence 4 and developed in 5, 8, 14, 18, 21, 22 (twice), 25 and 26 (four times). Sons and daughters (υἱός, θυγάτηρ) are mentioned in 21; children (παῖς) are mentioned in 22 and 26. The topic of being common (κοινός) is introduced in sentence 4 (twice) and developed in 5, 9, 10, 19 and 20. The topic of honor (τιμή) is introduced in sentence 4 and developed in 7, 9, 14, 18 (twice), 19, 22, 24, 25, 26 and 27 (twice). The topic of favor (χάρις) is introduced in sentence 1 and developed in 18 (twice), 19, 22 and 26. The topic of time (χρόνος) is introduced in sentence 1 and developed in 5, 13, 14, 17, 21, 22 and 26. The topic of law (νόμος) is introduced in sentence 4 and developed in 9, 14 (twice), 16, 18 and 27. Being illegal (παράνομος) is mentioned in 27.

<sup>(89)</sup> See WATSON, *Invention*, 145-46.

complex sentence with the protasis introduced by ἐπεὶ, and the apodosis by τότε. A relative clause is dependent on the main clause of the protasis, and a participial phrase modifies the subject of the relative clause. A compound purpose clause, introduced by ὅπως, is dependent on the apodosis. This purpose clause consists of two clauses introduced by μὴ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί. A brief relative clause is dependent on the first of these. This period consists of five clauses, of which the last is the longest. According to Waldis, this sentence exhibits the following figures in addition to the tropes and transplacements listed above: litotes, isocolon, homoioteleuton and alliteration<sup>(90)</sup>.

Another elaborate sentence is sentence 19. The main clause of the sentence is the imperative clause that the priest should afford common enjoyment of the festival for the gatherings of the crowds. This clause is preceded by three participial phrases, each modifying the implied subject of the imperative. The main clause is then followed by two more participial phrases also modifying the subject of the imperative. A brief clause is dependent on the first of these phrases. A purpose clause, introduced by ὅπως, is dependent on the second. The purpose clause includes a participial phrase modifying the subject of the clause, and a second participle introducing a dependent adverbial clause. This period consists of four clauses; in its abundant use of participial phrases, it is similar to 2 Pet 2,12-14. According to Waldis, this sentence of the inscription exhibits hendyades, homoioteleuton, alliteration and antithesis, in addition to the tropes and transplacement listed above.

A third elaborate sentence is sentence 22. This is a compound sentence consisting of three independent clauses, all with imperative verbs. The first clause states that no one should enslave the sacred slaves of the sanctuary or their descendents, or interfere with them in other ways. Two relative clauses are dependent on this clause, the first modifying the sacred slaves, the second their descendents. The second independent clause, introduced by ἀλλ', states that the priests should take care of the sacred slaves, and the third, introduced by δέ, states that various people should aid them. A relative clause depends on this third independent clause; it modifies the subject of the independent clause. This period consists of six clauses, and there is an antithetical relationship between the first independent clause on one hand and the

<sup>(90)</sup> For grammatical analysis of this and the other sentences of the inscription see WALDIS, *Sprache und Stil*, 3-11, 71-74. For tropes and figures in the inscription see pp. 66-71.

second and third independent clauses on the other. According to Waldis, this sentence exhibits anaphora, polysyndeton, homoio-teleuton, alliteration (twice) and antithesis, in addition to the tropes listed above.

\*  
\* \*

We have seen that the vocabulary and syntax of 2 Pet display the kinds of ornamentation recommended by Cicero, Quintilian and others. We have also seen that the quantity and quality of this stylistic ornamentation indicate that 2 Pet is written in the grand style. Finally we have seen that the similarity between 2 Pet and the Nemrud Dagħ inscription, taken as representative of the grand Asian style, indicates that 2 Pet is written in that style.

This understanding of the style of 2 Pet can help us to see what the author intended to achieve and estimate his degree of success in doing so. We can also see that many negative assessments of the style of 2 Pet are not evaluations of it according to the canons of style recognized by its author and readers. Instead, they are implicitly expressions of preference for a different style, like the criticism of Asian style in its own time. Recognition of this may open the way to greater appreciation of this style on its own terms. Reicke compares Asian style to European art and literature of the baroque period, a parallel that may allow us to be more appreciative of this style<sup>(91)</sup>.

Writing in the grand style implies that the author of 2 Pet sees himself as expressing powerful and impressive thoughts. The author summarizes these thoughts in 2 Pet 1,3-11: since Jesus' divine power has given us everything needed for life and piety, including the hope of participating in divine nature (vv. 3-4), it is necessary to confirm this call and election (v. 10) by striving to grow in virtue (vv. 5-9) so as to enter the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (v. 11). We may readily agree that these are indeed powerful and impressive thoughts.

Writing in the grand style also implies that the author is attempting primarily to appeal to the emotions of his audience, not to inform or please them<sup>(92)</sup>. The author's principal aim is to arouse his readers to

<sup>(91)</sup> REICKE, *James, Peter and Jude*, 146-47. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF had earlier compared Asian style to baroque style, "Asianismus und Atticismus", 400-401, cf. 374.

<sup>(92)</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Orator*, 69; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 12.10.59.

strive for growth in virtue in order to be suited for the new heavens and earth that are coming. It is necessary to pursue this aim because the readers are being exposed to other teachers who seem to doubt that new heavens and earth are coming and thus doubt that efforts to grow in virtue are needed. The author tries to prevent his readers from accepting this teaching. He does so by offering various arguments for his position. However, they are presented in a highly ornate way so that they appeal to emotion as well as to reason.

Writing in the Asian style implies that the author stood outside the main stream of literary development in the first and second centuries, which was flowing in the direction of Attic style. It would have been possible to write in this style anywhere, even in Rome, by imitating writers like Demosthenes or Cicero. However, the author's Asian style may imply that 2 Pet was not written in Rome or in any other cultural center, but rather somewhere like Commagene, the location of the Nemrud Dagħ inscription.

The author of 2 Pet was rather adept in the rhetoric of his time. He had surely received at least an elementary education in a Greek school or in a Jewish school modeled on Greek schools. This is indicated by his literacy in Greek and the literary level of the letter. His rhetorical skill might have been acquired without higher education. For example, Frederick W. Danker suggests that inscriptions would have provided rhetorical formation for those who could read them, or who heard them read<sup>(93)</sup>. However, it seems more likely that the author had received higher education in rhetoric.

Athenaeum of Ohio  
Cincinnati, OH 45230 (USA)

Terrance CALLAN

#### SUMMARY

Readers of the Second Letter of Peter have often commented on its style, usually in negative terms. This essay examines the style of 2 Pet more thoroughly than has been done heretofore, using Cicero's discussion of style, and that of other ancient writers, as a framework. This examination shows that 2 Pet largely conforms to ancient canons of style and should be seen as an example of the grand Asian style. Recognition of this may help readers avoid unthinking assessment of 2 Pet's style by standards not accepted by its author, and develop greater appreciation of its style in terms of its author's own aims and standards.

<sup>(93)</sup> DANKER, "2 Peter 1", 64-65.

## **The Jubilee: A Post-Exilic Priestly Attempt to Reclaim Lands?**

Traditionally, the jubilee year of Leviticus 25 has been viewed as priestly legislation aimed at ensuring the perpetual land-rights of the small landowner and his descendants by preventing latifundism — the accumulation of large estates by the wealthy. In recent scholarship on this chapter, however, a different view of the intent of the jubilee legislation has gained popularity. This view regards the jubilee legislation as the production of exilic or post-exilic priests, with the intent to justify legally the repossession of lands lost in the exile by themselves and other returning Judean exiles. For lack of a better term, this view may be called the “land-reclamation” hypothesis.

This paper attempts to open discussion on the “land-reclamation” hypothesis, asking whether it is capable of explaining the presence or absence of various features in Lev 25. The issue of the dating of the final redaction of the text, though interesting in itself and pertinent to the subject, is not the main focus of this paper<sup>(1)</sup>: the only question is

<sup>(1)</sup> Of course, if it could be established that the Holiness Code is a product of the pre-exilic period, it would invalidate the “land-reclamation” hypothesis. Some recent scholarship presents arguments for a pre-exilic dating, e.g. I. KNOHL, *The Sanctuary of Silence*. The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School (Minneapolis 1995) 199-224, esp. 207-209; J. JOOSTEN, *People and Land in the Holiness Code*. An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26 (VTS 67; Leiden 1996) 84-92; and J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 17–22*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 3A; New York 2000) 1361-1364; ID., “Does H Advocate the Centralization of Worship?”, *JSOT* 88 (2000) 59-76, all of whom argue for a setting in the monarchic period. To the contrary K. GRÜN WALDT, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17–26*. Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie (BZAW 271; Berlin 1999) 375-381, defends the position that H is late-exilic. Grünwaldt argues in part from the dependence of H on exilic biblical texts. However, the direction of dependence is not unambiguous. For example, on the crucial issue of the relationship of Ezekiel to H, some recent scholarship argues strongly for the priority of H, e.g. R.L. KOHN, “A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah” (Ph.D. Dissertation; University of California, San Diego, 1997); ID., “Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah”, *Society of Biblical Literature 1999 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 38; Atlanta 1999) 501-526; ID., “A Prophet Like Moses? Rethinking Ezekiel’s Relationship to the Torah”, *ZAW* 114 (2002) 236-254; J. MILGROM, “Leviticus 26 and Ezekiel”, *The Quest for Context and Meaning*. Studies in

whether the repossession of lands by the returning exiles *motivated* the redaction. The paper concludes that there are some impediments to accepting the “land-reclamation” hypothesis: (1) the jubilee legislation in its final form did not serve the interests of returning exiles, whether priestly or lay; and (2) the text betrays few signs of having been redacted or augmented with a “land-reclamation” agenda. A comparison of Lev 25 with the vision of land allocation in Ezek 45–48 underscores the differences between the jubilee legislation and what is widely regarded as an actual exilic priestly blueprint for the redistribution of land.

### I. A Brief History of Scholarship on the Subject

The first biblical scholar to suggest that the jubilee legislation was redacted with the intent to justify the recovery of lands by the returning exiles seems to have been Gerhard Wallis in 1969. He summarizes his approach in an English abstract appended to his article “Das Jubeljahr-Gesetz, eine Novelle zum Sabbathjahr Gesetz”:

---

Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders (ed. C.A. EVANS – S. TALMON) (Leiden 1997) 57–62; *id.*, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1362. For older scholarship arguing Ezekiel’s dependence on H, see A. KLOSTERMANN, “Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs”, *ZLThK* 38 (1877) 401–445; and H.G. REVENTLOW, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht* (WMANT 6; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1961) esp. 30; but also L. HORST, *Leviticus xvii–xxvi und Hezekiel. Ein Beitrag zur Pentateuchkritik* (Colmar 1881); L.E. ELLIOT–BINNS, “Some Problems of the Holiness Code”, *ZAW* 67 (1955) 26–40. Binns and Horst regard H as having been available to Ezekiel, but as uncompiled, independent traditions. The relationship of H to Ezekiel is significant: since much or all of Ezekiel appears exilic, Ezekiel’s dependence on H would indicate a pre-exilic date for the latter. On the exilic dating of much or all of Ezekiel, see W. ZIMMERLI, “The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel’s Prophecy”, *VT* 15 (1965) 515–516; L. BOADT, *Ezekiel’s Oracles against Egypt* (BibOr 37; Rome 1980); B. LANG, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem. Die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel* (SBB; Stuttgart 1981); W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 1* (trans. R.E. CLEMENTS) (Philadelphia 1983) 68–73; M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1–20* (AB 22; New York 1983) 18–27; *id.*, “What Are Valid Criteria for Determining Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?”, *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. J. LUST) (Leuven 1986) 123–135; T. COLLINS, *The Mantle of Elijah. The Redactional Criticism of the Prophetical Books* (BiSe 20; Sheffield 1993) 91–93; E.F. DAVIS, *Swallowing the Scroll. Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel’s Prophecy* (JSOTSS 78; Sheffield 1989); L.C. ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; Dallas 1986) XXIV–XXVI; and D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24* (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1997) 17–23.

This Law of the Jubilee originates from the later exilic times and should open to the people returning from the exile the possibility of regaining in the homeland the rights of land-owning, which probably had been lost during the years of their absence<sup>(2)</sup>.

Wallis also argues that the interval of forty-nine years "means" either the time between the first deportation (597 BCE) and Second Isaiah (548 BCE) or between the second deportation (587 BCE) and the edict of Cyrus (538 BCE).

Wallis's suggestion was taken up by several important scholars of the jubilee legislation and related texts, such as Innocenzo Cardellini (1981)<sup>(3)</sup>, Baruch Levine (1983)<sup>(4)</sup>, and Sharon Ringe (1985):

The new compilation [of the Holiness Code] would resolve a major problem accompanying the people's return from the exile, namely, the allocation and subsequent management of the land<sup>(5)</sup>.

Interpretations along similar lines were offered by Marvin Chaney (1991)<sup>(6)</sup>, Jeffrey Fager (1993)<sup>(7)</sup>, Norman C. Habel (1995)<sup>(8)</sup>, and most notably, Norman K. Gottwald:

The jubilee programme can thus be viewed as the political and economic ploy of the Aaronid priests to achieve leadership in restored Judah by dispensing benefits to a wide swath of the populace, presumably with the civil and military support from the Persians<sup>(9)</sup>.

<sup>(2)</sup> G. WALLIS, "Das Jubeljahr-Gesetz, eine Novelle zum Sabbathjahr-Gesetz", *MIOF* 5 (1969) 344-345.

<sup>(3)</sup> I. CARDELLINI, *Die biblischen "Sklaven"-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts*. Ein Beitrag zur Tradition, Überlieferung und Redaktion der alttestamentlichen Rechtstexte (BBB 55; Bonn 1981) 363-375.

<sup>(4)</sup> B.A. LEVINE, "Late Language in the Priestly Source: Some Literary and Historical Observations", *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem Aug 16-21, 1981*. Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Hebrew Language (ed. D. KRONE) (Jerusalem 1983) 69-82.

<sup>(5)</sup> S.H. RINGE, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee*. Images for Ethics and Christology (Overtures to Biblical Theology 19; Philadelphia 1985) 26.

<sup>(6)</sup> M.L. CHANEY, "Debt Easement in Israelite History and Tradition", *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis*. Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (ed. D. JOBLING et al.) (Cleveland 1991) 127-139, esp. 138-139.

<sup>(7)</sup> J.A. FAGER, *Land Tenure and the Biblical Jubilee*. Uncovering Hebrew Ethics through the Sociology of Knowledge (JSOTSS 155; Sheffield 1993) 60-63.

<sup>(8)</sup> N.C. HABEL, *The Land is Mine*. Six Biblical Land Ideologies (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Minneapolis 1995) 97-114, esp. 113.

<sup>(9)</sup> N.K. GOTTWALD, "The Biblical Jubilee: In Whose Interests?", *The Jubilee Challenge: Utopia or Possibility?* (ed. H. UCKO) (Geneva 1997) 37. Gottwald

However, according to Jacob Milgrom, Gottwald apparently no longer advocates this position<sup>(10)</sup>.

Nonetheless, this stream of interpretation has apparently become powerful enough to sway Klaus Grünwaldt<sup>(11)</sup>, Francesco Bianchi<sup>(12)</sup>, and perhaps the greatest scholar of the jubilee, Robert G. North, who has recently revised his original settlement-era dating of the jubilee legislation<sup>(13)</sup>:

[We] feel securely within the competent majority in claiming that the Jubilee-decree itself was the last part of Lev 25 to be composed, near the end of the Exile and in view of repossessing Judah [*sic*] lands, though quite possibly retrieving a similar proposal from as early as the Joshua-settlement era<sup>(14)</sup>.

Most of these scholars are somewhat vague about how the jubilee legislation would have functioned practically in a land dispute between

---

does not flesh out his proposal further. Is it really true that a return to the land distribution situation of 587 BCE would please those living in Yehud in the 530's? Isn't it just as likely that such a move would alienate all those who had not been exiled, and even some who had? What would be done with lands formerly owned by the crown or by people who had died or decided not to return from Babylon? How confident can one be that the Aaronid priests had the civil and military support of the Persians in the early (pre-Ezra) post-exilic period? If the redaction of the jubilee legislation is placed in the exile, a certain lack of correspondence between the legislation and the actual post-exilic situation can be excused, since the redactors did not know exactly how the restoration would take shape. By placing the redaction among the priests "on the ground" in post-exilic Yehud, Gottwald makes it harder for himself to explain the lack of correspondence between the jubilee and actual post-exilic conditions.

<sup>(10)</sup> J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 23–27. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3B; New York 2001) 2242–2243.

<sup>(11)</sup> GRÜN WALDT, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 380–381.

<sup>(12)</sup> F. BIANCHI, "Das Jubeljahr in der hebräischen Bibel und in den nachkanonischen jüdischen Texten", *Das Jubeljahr im Wandel. Untersuchungen zu Erlaßjahr- und Jubeljahrtexten aus vier Jahrtausenden* (ed. G. SCHEUERMANN) (FZB 94; Würzburg 2000) 55–104, esp. 84–89. Bianchi places Lev 25 in the very late 6<sup>th</sup> century, without responding to the arguments of KNOHL (*Sanctuary*, 199–224) and JOOSTEN (*People and Land*, 84–92) for a substantially pre-exilic H. Milgrom's position on the jubilee (*Leviticus 23–27*, 2241–2257) would have been unavailable to him.

<sup>(13)</sup> For North's original position, see R.G. NORTH, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee* (AnBib 4; Rome 1954), 212, et passim.

<sup>(14)</sup> R.G. NORTH, *The Biblical Jubilee ... After Fifty Years* (AnBib 145; Rome 2000) 114. North makes similar comments on pp. 11–12, 18, 19, 31, 82, 83, 97, 103, 108, 112, 113. (But see p. 98, where he equivocates, seemingly re-affirming his 1954 position).



returning exiles and non-exiled Israelites<sup>(15)</sup>. Was Lev 25 meant as binding law to be produced in court to verify one's land rights? Or was it only for "internal" use, to provide intellectual reasoning for those who already believed in the priests' and exiles' position? Lack of specificity on matters like this makes the hypothesis difficult to subject to analysis. Moreover, the different proponents of this same general position differ among themselves in the specifics they do supply. For example, some scholars argue that the legislation was produced in early restoration Judea<sup>(16)</sup>, while others insist a post-exilic redaction is impossible due to the lack of correspondence between the jubilee legislation and the actual restoration situation<sup>(17)</sup>.

No direct evidence — biblical or extra-biblical, textual or archeological — has yet been produced to substantiate this hypothesis<sup>(18)</sup>. Our sources do not indicate that the exiles attempted to regain ancestral lands upon their return and met opposition, much less that Lev 25 was put forward as a legal basis for such an attempt. The sources do not even indicate that the exiles made a serious attempt to return to the exact property held by their ancestors<sup>(19)</sup>. Therefore, the

<sup>(15)</sup> A case in point is the position of Cardellini, who seems to vacillate between viewing Lev 25 as earnest legislation and as utopian vision. On the one hand he states, "der Text verlangt zwingend eine konkrete Basis, weil er konkrete Bestimmungen enthält [wurde]" (369), but on the other, "das Jubeljahr schon von Anfang an nicht als wirksame rechtliche Vorschrift verstanden wurde" (374). Likewise, Bianchi (*Jobeljahr*, 84-89), despite an extensive discussion of the social history of early post-exilic Judah, never describes how or by whom exactly the jubilee was *supposed* to have been promulgated and implemented, although he is confident it never was. In our opinion, this vagueness on the part of scholars as to the exact nature and intention of Lev 25 arises from the fact that the legislation cannot quite be made to fit the post-exilic situation.

<sup>(16)</sup> GOTTWALD, "Jubilee", 37; CHANEY, "Debt-Easement", 138-139.

<sup>(17)</sup> WALLIS, "Jobeljahr-Gesetz", 344; also Gottwald as quoted in MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2242-2243.

<sup>(18)</sup> Interestingly, in the opinion of, e.g., Bianchi, the lack of any evidence of the observation of the jubilee in the monarchic period rules out the possibility of a pre-exilic setting of Lev 25 ("Jobeljahr", 83); but the same lack of evidence for the post-exilic period is explained by the fact that the reform movement represented by Lev 25 was abortive ("Jobeljahr", 87-88). Thus, silence means different things in the pre- and post-exilic periods.

<sup>(19)</sup> In Ezra 2,3-35, some of the returning Israelites are identified not by their ancestor but by their ancestral town. Ezra 2,70 simply reports that the Israelites "took up residence in their towns." If there was opposition to their resettlement, or a contested attempt on the part of exiles to reclaim family estates from before the exile, it is not reflected in this text. Neither do Haggai or Zechariah reflect such a situation. Neh 11,1 indicates that the resettlement of Jerusalem took place

hypothesis of a “land-reclamation” redaction of Lev 25 remains, in the words of Norman Gottwald, purely an “exercise in historical imagination”<sup>(20)</sup>. That does not necessarily mean it is false, only unsubstantiated. It is fair to ask, however, whether the hypothesis does indeed meet even the standards of “historical imagination”.

## II. Does the Jubilee Legislation Serve the Interests of the Returning Exiles?

### 1. *Who Benefited from the Jubilee?*

A common assumption of the “land-reclamation” hypothesis is that the jubilee legislation served the interests of the returning exiles. In order to examine this assumption critically, it is necessary to ascertain (1) which socio-economic groups benefited from the jubilee, and (2) which socio-economic groups were exiled.

Although many points of interpretation of the jubilee are hotly debated, there is remarkable unanimity concerning the beneficiaries of the legislation. The two scholars who have devoted monographs to the subject in the past fifty years — North and Fager — are in agreement:

It would be more directly evident ... that the whole concern of Lev 25 is with the independent small farmer ...<sup>(21)</sup>.

Since the purpose of the jubilee seems to have been to preserve the economic integrity of the peasant farmer, there was no need to protect urban property from alienation<sup>(22)</sup>.

---

by lot, i.e. apparently with disregard for pre-exilic property assignments. Jer 32,6-15 may testify to a pre-exilic hope that exact property titles would be restored. On the other hand, Ezek 47,13-48,29 gives instructions for a completely new post-exilic re-allotment of land which abolishes pre-exilic boundaries.

<sup>(20)</sup> GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 38. It would seem that, since the need to regain lands for the exiles turned out not to be an issue, if one presumes the land-reclamation hypothesis for the final redaction of Lev 25, then the *terminus ad quem* for this redaction would be the initial return of the exiles under Cyrus. After that time, it would be clear to all that the issue was moot. Before this time, it might be imagined that priests in the exile thought there would be a larger population of returning exiles and more resistance from those who had settled on the land in the meantime, such that they would anticipate a conflict over land and thus a need for legislation authorizing the restoration of the exiles’ property. Proposals for a land-reclamation redaction by *post-exilic* priests are not realistic, since there is no historical evidence that any such conflict over an attempt to regain pre-exilic lands — which *exilic* priests may have anticipated — actually developed. Cf. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2242-2243.

<sup>(21)</sup> NORTH, *After Fifty Years*, 34.

<sup>(22)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 88-89.

North also adds that “a flourishing commercial orientation [is] quite different from the petty-agriculture focus with which most of the jubilee chapter deals”<sup>(23)</sup>. Similar views on the focus and beneficiaries of the legislation are expressed by Habel<sup>(24)</sup>, Gottwald<sup>(25)</sup>, Albrecht<sup>(26)</sup>, and Milgrom<sup>(27)</sup>.

If the beneficiaries of the jubilee are the “independent” or “peasant” farmers, what socio-economic classes were exiled? According to the deuteronomistic historian, the classes taken into exile at the first deportation were the royal court, the “notables” (אֲדָרָאִים), the military, craftsmen, and smiths — about 10,000 in all (2 Kgs 24,13-17). At the second deportation, the “remnant of the population” of Jerusalem was taken (2 Kgs 25,11), including “what remained of the craftsmen” (Jer 52,15). In both deportations, “the poorest people in the land” were left “to be vinedressers and field hands” (2 Kgs 24,14; 25,12; Jer 52,15-16).

Thus, according to the deuteronomistic historian(s), the exiles were the urban elite, *not* the rural farming class whom the jubilee legislation was designed to protect. The first deportation, in 597 BCE, was certainly the most significant in quantity and “quality” of people. In the second, the “urban elite” was considerably smaller (cf. Jer 52,28-30). The non-exiled “poorest people of the land” almost certainly would have included the “small independent farmers” who would benefit from the jubilee legislation<sup>(28)</sup>.

<sup>(23)</sup> NORTH, *After Fifty Years*, 58.

<sup>(24)</sup> HABEL, *The Land*, 97, 111, 112 — “There is a strong concern in this proposed social order to preserve the traditional landholdings of the peasants and maintain their independence over against rich landowners”, 113 — “The ideal of the peasant society depicted in Leviticus 25–27 is that peasant farmers will be completely free from domination by the urban elite.”

<sup>(25)</sup> GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 35. Although ultimately Gottwald argues that “the priests” put forward the jubilee legislation in their own interests, the priests’ interests are tied to the fact that the legislation would “dispense benefits to a wide swath of the population” (37).

<sup>(26)</sup> “Hence the degressive cancellation of debt within the period of the Year of Jubilee should very much be understood as a serious attempt to restructure economic laws for the sake of preventing small farmers from falling ever more deeply into debt” (R. ALBRECHT, *Der Mensch als Hüter seiner Welt* [Stuttgart 1990] 53; trans. in E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus* [OTL; Louisville 1993] 380).

<sup>(27)</sup> MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2243, and elsewhere.

<sup>(28)</sup> It is interesting to note the mention of the “remnant” working the vineyards and fields (2 Kgs 25,12; Jer 52,15-16), since vineyards and fields are mentioned together several times in Lev 25 (vv. 3-5.11).

Of course, the accuracy and agenda of the deuteronomistic historian and the redactor of Jeremiah have been challenged<sup>(29)</sup>, but these challenges do not effect the present argument, since — at least to our knowledge — no one disputes the fact that the deportees consisted of the urban upper classes, i.e. those who would pose a potential political threat to Babylonian rule<sup>(30)</sup>. This is congruent with known Babylonian policy. As Martin Noth describes it,

After the old upper class in Jerusalem and Judah had been taken away in 598 B.C., mainly the urban population of Jerusalem was deported [in 587 B.C.], presumably again to Babylonia. The peasant population, on the other hand, remained where they were<sup>(31)</sup>.

The urban character of the exiled population is hard to reconcile with the exception of urban property from the jubilee laws, if the legislation was produced or redacted to benefit them. Lev 25,29-34 excludes the sale of houses within cities from the release of the jubilee, with the exception of *levitical* property in *levitical cities*, which Jerusalem was not (cf. 1 Chr 6,34-66). Why would the returning “priests” specifically forbid to themselves and the other exiles the opportunity to recover their urban residences? Why does the exception for levitical property not include Jerusalem? This is particularly ironic, given the fact that a large number of the exiles were Jerusalemites.

In sum, the problem for the “land-reclamation” hypothesis is this: “the purpose of the jubilee seems to have been to preserve the economic integrity of the peasant farmer”<sup>(32)</sup> the very segment of the population *not* exiled. The exiles were the urban elite who benefited from the system of latifundism expressly opposed by the jubilee<sup>(33)</sup>. How then is the jubilee legislation a product or redaction of the

<sup>(29)</sup> See, e.g. R.P. CARROLL, “The Myth of the Empty Land”, *Semeia* 59 (1992) 79-93, and H.M. BARSTAD, *The Myth of the Empty Land. A Study in the History and Archeology of Judah During the “Exilic” Period* (SO.S 28; Oslo 1996). Although challenging other aspects of the biblical presentation of the exile, Barstad concurs that the exiles were “Judahite elites.”

<sup>(30)</sup> See M. NOTH, *The History of Israel* (New York 1960) 282, 287; J.M. MILLER – J. H. HAYES, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia 1986) 420, 424; and J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (Louisville 2000) 327-328, 331, 345.

<sup>(31)</sup> NOTH, *History*, 287.

<sup>(32)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 88-89.

<sup>(33)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 85: “Such a power structure [i.e. latifundism] benefited the urban classes and the wealthy creditors who were able to accumulate large landholdings and keep the peasants in a dependent status”.

interests of the returning exiles, priestly or lay? Realizing this, Habel even suggests the non-exiled rural population as a possible *Sitz-im-Leben* for the origin of the jubilee legislation<sup>(34)</sup>.

## 2. The “Inhabitants”?

There is also phraseology in Lev 25 that would be particularly awkward for returning urban exiles. Lev 25,10 mandates “You shall proclaim release throughout the land for all *its inhabitants* [יְשִׁבֵּיהָ].” This wording would have the potential to backfire against the exiles, who in fact were not “inhabitants” of the land, and largely had not been for more than sixty years<sup>(35)</sup>. Ironically, it would favor those whose lands the exiles wished to repossess, especially since — as we will demonstrate below — the inhabitants of the land regarded themselves as having been confirmed in their right to the land by the divine action of the exile<sup>(36)</sup>. If the text was augmented or redacted for post-exilic “land-reclamation” purposes, we would expect יְשִׁבֵּיהָ to be replaced with something more generic, such as בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל.

## 3. The “Priests”?

But perhaps it was not the exiled population *per se* that was meant to benefit from the jubilee, but only the priestly caste. This position has been put forward forcefully by Ringe:

The priestly compilers of the laws ... would not only have established their own authority over the regulation of the land and its inhabitants, but at the same time would have legitimized their administration by a reaffirmation of its basis in God’s sovereignty. The religious sanction that such legislation would have lent to their authority would have been crucial in the consolidation of their power and in the establishment of the holy and righteous people under God which was their aim<sup>(37)</sup>.

<sup>(34)</sup> HABEL, *The Land*, 113.

<sup>(35)</sup> As will be discussed further below, the period from the second deportation to the edict of Cyrus was about forty-nine years. However, most of the exiles were taken in the first deportation (597 BCE), *fifty-nine* years before the edict of Cyrus. And it cannot be taken for granted that even Sheshbazzar’s expedition — if indeed he led one — returned within a year of the edict.

<sup>(36)</sup> Interestingly, Ezekiel uses virtually the same word (יָשַׁב) as Lev 25,10 to refer to those *left behind* by the second deportation (Ezek 11,15), as opposed to the exiles.

<sup>(37)</sup> RINGE, *Jesus*, 26-27.

Similar views can be found in Habel<sup>(38)</sup> and Gottwald<sup>(39)</sup>. However, Fager, while holding that “the priests” may have benefited from receiving back some land, sufficiently points out the inadequacy of this kind of argument:

There are those who believe the jubilee actually bestowed power on the priests through its control of land distribution ... However, the jubilee worked automatically, independent from priestly prerogatives, and it tended to maintain a relatively equal distribution of land, dispersing economic power widely. At most, the priests may have wanted to establish the returning exiles’ right to their ‘fair share’ of the land; however, had they wanted control of the distribution of the land, they could have stated that explicitly in the legislation; the simple presence of the jubilee in the Priestly Code does not express a grab for power by the priests<sup>(40)</sup>.

### III. Does the Jubilee Legislation Show Signs of a “Land-reclamation” Redaction?

One weakness of the “land-reclamation” hypothesis is that nothing in Lev 25 requires it for explanation. Indeed, prior to Wallis (1969), commentators such as Wellhausen, Kuenen, Eerdmans, Ginzberg, Albright, Jirku, Eichrodt, Noth, and Snaith found it unnecessary to

<sup>(38)</sup> HABEL, *The Land*, 111-112.

<sup>(39)</sup> GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 36-37.

<sup>(40)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 99. Habel gives an additional twist to the argument rejected by Fager. He believes that since gifts of land to the LORD — if not redeemed before the jubilee — became the permanent property of the priests (Lev 27,20-21), therefore the legislation gave the priests higher social standing, since they alone were able progressively to gain land (HABEL, *The Land*, 110-113). Two things count against this argument, however. First, the priests, as a subset of Levites, were barred from owning land, a fact implied by Lev 25,32-34 (cf. NOTH, *Leviticus*, 190-191; MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2201) and acknowledged elsewhere in the Bible (Num 35,2-3; Deut 18,1; Josh 14,4; Ezek 44,28-31). Lev 27,20-21 is an exceptional case in which they needed to administer property belonging to the sanctuary. Would this exception really be enough to offset their general landlessness, such that they would attain greater “social standing”? Secondly, the priests had no coercive power to gain land. They were entirely passive in the transaction of Lev 27,20-21, dependent on the good will of individual Israelites who may have wanted to devote part of their ancestral property to God. Even then, it was only if the land was never redeemed before the jubilee that it passed to priestly hands. Is this a scheme to aggrandize and enrich the priesthood? Surely better and easier ones could be devised, if that were the intent. “The priests” could have simply written in an exception for themselves to buy and sell land without being subject to the jubilee.

have recourse to such a hypothesis<sup>(41)</sup>. Subsequent commentators such as Porter, Wenham, Gerstenberger, Hartley, and Milgrom have felt similarly uncompelled<sup>(42)</sup>.

The “land-reclamation” perspective does not have a particular heuristic value, such that upon accepting it, details of the text that were obscure suddenly become meaningful. Rather, the opposite is the case. If the final redaction was a post-exilic power-play for the repossession of real estate, then the extensive instructions regarding the alleviation of debt-slavery in vv. 23-55 — most of the textual unit — become irrelevant to the intent of the final redaction, and thus a distraction from — rather than an indication of — the central thrust of the text.

### 1. *The Forty-nine Years*

One aspect of the text that the “land-reclamation” hypothesis claims to explain is the forty-nine-year duration of the jubilee cycle. Frequently it is asserted that the period between jubilees was somehow inspired by the forty-nine years between the second deportation (587 BCE) and the edict of Cyrus (538 BCE). In other words, the returning priests established the jubilee period at forty-nine years in order to justify, upon their return in 538 BCE, the restoration of land ownership to the situation in 587 BCE. However, this assertion is both implausible and unnecessary, for the following reasons:

(1) According to both the deuteronomistic historian (2 Kgs 24,14-17; 25,11) and the book of Jeremiah (Jer 52,28-30), a much larger group of exiles was deported in 597 BCE than in 587 BCE<sup>(43)</sup>. If the

<sup>(41)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, “Pentateuch and Joshua”, *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Edinburgh 1885) XVII, 513; A. KUENEN, *Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London 1886); B.D. EERDMANS, *Das Buch Leviticus* (Alttestamentliche Studien IV; Giessen 1912); E. GINZBERG, “Studies in the Economics of the Bible”, *JQR* 22 (1932) 343-408; W.F. ALBRIGHT, *Archeology of Palestine and the Bible* (New York 1933) 156; A. JIRKU, “Das israelitische Jubeljahr”, *Seeberg-Festschrift* (Leipzig 1929) II, 169-179; W. EICHRODT, “Religionsgeschichte Israels”, *Historia Mundi* (ed. F. Kern – F. Valjavec) (Bern 1953) II, 385; M. NOTH, *Leviticus* (trans. J.E. ANDERSON) (OTL; London 1965); N.H. SNAITH, *Leviticus and Numbers* (CeB; London 1967).

<sup>(42)</sup> J.R. PORTER, *Leviticus* (London 1976); G.J. WENHAM, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1979); J.E. HARTLEY, *Leviticus* (WBC; Dallas 1992); E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus* (OTL; Louisville 1993); MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27.

<sup>(43)</sup> According to Jer 52,28, the first deportation was more than three times larger than the second. It could be argued that these figures are inaccurate. However, it must be acknowledged that 2 Kgs 24,14-17; 25,11; and Jer 52,28-30

impression given by these sources is even approximately correct, any attempt on the part of the returnees shortly after 538 BCE to restore the land tenure situation to what it had been forty-nine years before would have invalidated the land claims of a majority — perhaps a large majority — of the returning exiles, who had been deported *fifty-nine* years previously.

(2) The only large-scale simultaneous return of exiles for which we have information is the one under Zerubbabel, which is generally held to have occurred a decade or more after 538 BCE <sup>(44)</sup>, by which time the forty-nine-year period would no longer be appropriate.

(3) There is no support in the text of Lev 25 to justify interpreting Cyrus' edict as marking a year of jubilee <sup>(45)</sup>. One has difficulty imagining how the exiles could advance such an argument, based on this text, in a title dispute against the actual inhabitants of the land of Israel.

(4) Taking the edict of Cyrus as the end of the jubilee cycle ironically implies the cycle *began* in 587 BCE, the year the (second wave of) exiles *left* the land, not the year they *entered* the land, which runs directly counter to Lev 25,1.

In addition to being implausible, the supposed explanation of the

---

are the product of exilic or post-exilic redactors, and both books almost undoubtedly reflect the perspective of the exiles and their descendants (cf. Jer 24,5-6.8.10; 2 Kgs 24,14; 25,12), not those who remained in the land. So, according to the exiles' own beliefs, the majority of them were taken in 597 BCE (cf. R.P. CARROLL, "Empty Land", who argues that almost all the relevant biblical literature reflects the perspective of the exiles of 597 BCE and their descendants, who naturally saw this deportation as the most important.) If the exiles had invented a jubilee terminating with Cyrus' decree, it should have been on a fifty-nine year cycle.

<sup>(44)</sup> Many scholars hold the view that there was an initial return under Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1,9), and a larger one under Zerubbabel sometime later, c. 525 BCE. However, there is no record of Sheshbazzar's expedition, and John Bright concludes, "It is unlikely that any major return of exiles took place at this time" (*A History of Israel*, [Louisville '2000], 362-363). Miller and Hayes argue that conditions were not conducive for a large-scale return until the reign of Cambyses (530-522 BCE) (cf. MILLER – HAYES, *History*, 446-447).

<sup>(45)</sup> The chronicler (i.e. 2 Chr 36,20-23) makes a connection between the period of the exile and the sabbatical years of Lev 25,1-7, and thus may subtly hint at an association between the Cyrus edict and the jubilee year. However, this would be a reinterpretation of the text of Leviticus; there are no traces of an identification of the jubilee with Cyrus' decree in the text of Lev 25 itself. Interestingly, even in Lev 26, which is closely linked with Lev 25 thematically and linguistically, there is no explicit promise of a return from the exile.



jubilee cycle by the duration of the second deportation is unnecessary, since there already exists an explanation for the jubilee cycle that is internal to the Holiness Code. The Feast of Weeks (Lev 23,15-16) is based on the same  $49 + 1$  numerology as the jubilee, and is a much more proximate and likely inspiration for the pattern<sup>(46)</sup>. However, in their eagerness to attribute the forty-nine years of the jubilee to the duration of the second deportation, advocates of the land-reclamation hypothesis have more or less completely overlooked the similarity between the Feast of Weeks (Lev 23,15-16) and the jubilee (Lev 25,8-10)<sup>(47)</sup>, despite the fact that the correlation was already recognized by Wellhausen<sup>(48)</sup> and — long before him — by the rabbis (*Sifra Emor* 12,8).

The  $49 + 1$  pattern of both the Feast of Weeks and the jubilee has its origin in the “seven-mysticism” that is pervasive in the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible<sup>(49)</sup>. Forty-nine is seven times seven, and therefore a quintessentially numinous number. In fact, the text of the jubilee itself stresses the significance of forty-nine as the square of seven:

<sup>(46)</sup> See e.g. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2163, 2166.

<sup>(47)</sup> For example, a perusal of the indices of both FAGER (*Land Tenure*, 132) and CARDELLINI (“*Sklaven*”-Gesetze, 436) reveals that neither makes reference to Lev 23,15-16 anywhere within their monographs. Similarly, Bianchi shows no awareness of the correspondence of Lev 23,15-16 and Lev 25,8-10, but finds the coincidence of the lengths of the second deportation and the jubilee to be decisive evidence in support of a post-exilic setting for Lev 25 (“Jobeljahr”, 84).

<sup>(48)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta 1994) 118-120, esp. 119; repr. of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allen Enzies, with preface by W. Robertson Smith) (Edinburgh 1885); trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin <sup>2</sup>1883). Says Wellhausen, “In the Priestly Code the year of jubilee is further added to supplement in turn the sabbatical year (Lev. xxv 8 seq.). As the latter is framed to correspond with the seventh day, so the former corresponds with the fiftieth, i.e. with Pentecost, as is easily perceived from the parallelism of Lev. xxv. 8 with Lev. xxiii. 15. As the fiftieth day after the seven Sabbath days is celebrated as a closing festival of the forty-nine days’ period, so is the fiftieth year after the seven sabbatic [*sic*] years as rounding off the larger interval; the seven Sabbaths falling on harvest time, which are usually reckoned specially (Luke vi. 1), have, in the circumstance of their interrupting harvest work, a particular resemblance to the sabbatic years which interrupt agriculture altogether. The jubilee is ... superimposed upon the years of fallow regarded as harvest Sabbaths after the analogy of Pentecost” (118-119).

<sup>(49)</sup> On the significance of the number seven throughout the ancient Near East, see J. FREIBERG, “Numbers and Counting”, *ABD* IV, 1139-1146. On the use of seven in H, cf. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 17–22, 1323-1325; GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus*, 377; and SNAITH, *Leviticus*, 162, who mentions Assyrian examples of the sacrality of the number 49.

וספרת לך שבע שבחת שנים שבע פעמים והיו לך ימי שבע שבחת השנים  
חשע וארבעים שנה

You shall count off seven weeks of years — seven times seven years  
— so that the period of seven weeks of years gives you a total of forty-  
nine years (Lev 25,8).

The counting system of the Feast of Weeks (Lev 23,15-16) provides an explanation for the forty-nine years of the jubilee that is internal to the Holiness Code and arises naturally from the “seven-mysticism” characteristic of the same. It is unclear why an external and speculative explanation — such as the forty-nine years of the second deportation — is either necessary or compelling. Perhaps this line of reasoning would be more convincing if the number of years of both the jubilee and the second deportation were irregular or unprecedented in biblical literature, e.g. thirty-seven or sixty-one.

## 2. Omissions in the Text of Provisions for the Exilic Situation

There are at least three elements “missing” from the jubilee legislation which one would expect to be present had it been written or redacted with a “land-reclamation” agenda. The “omission” of these elements would have made the jubilee impossible to implement in the post-exilic situation, at least for the purpose of returning land to the exiles.

(1) From when does one count the jubilee cycle? Lev 25 does not provide a way of determining when the jubilee should be observed. The text simply says, “Count off seven Sabbaths of years” (v. 8). From when? The only suggestion in the text is found in v. 1: “When you enter the land”. Thus, the narrative projection of the text is that the Israelites should observe the jubilee every forty-nine (or fifty) years, starting from the year in which they entered the land, presumably under Joshua (i.e. the settlement).

How was this to apply to the post-exilic situation? Perhaps “when you enter the land” was meant to refer to the year the exiles returned. However, if the jubilee was meant to justify the immediate repossession of the exiles’ lands, why does the legislation not take effect until fifty years after they have returned to their homeland (v. 8)<sup>(50)</sup>? Would the exiles really want to wait in Israel fifty years before repossessing their lands?

(2) What if one misses a jubilee? The logistics of organizing a

<sup>(50)</sup> Cf. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2242.

major, permanent migration from Babylon back to Israel probably precludes the possibility that any large group of exiles returned within a year of Cyrus' edict (538 BCE)<sup>(51)</sup>. If 538 BCE was considered a jubilee year by the redactors of Lev 25 — as most “land-reclamation” proponents seem to hold — most of the exiles would have missed it. This raises another major omission of the text: what happens if one misses a jubilee? The text does not deal with the possibility that an heir to ancestral property might not be present to regain title to his land in the year of jubilee. Does the land then become the permanent possession of the current owner? Must the heir wait for the following jubilee to repossess it? Does it immediately revert to the heir in whatever year following the jubilee that he actually does show up to claim it? The text does not specify. However, the text does imply that jubilees have been counted since Israel's initial entry into Canaan. If this were actually the case, probably all the returning exiles would have missed a jubilee<sup>(52)</sup>. Any of the second wave (587 BCE) of deportees and their descendants who returned after 538-537 BCE would have missed the “jubilee” inaugurated by the edict of Cyrus. The larger first wave (597 BCE) of deportees and descendants would have missed two “jubilees”: the one in 587-586 BCE and that in 538-537 BCE. Any non-exiled Israelite whose land “the priests” wished to repossess could easily point out that the exiles had missed the last jubilee and therefore forfeited their land.

The missing of a jubilee is precisely the sort of issue one would expect to be dealt with by a redactor. A short gloss could quickly clarify the situation for the exiles benefit: “And if your brother Israelite should be in exile during the year of jubilee, and unable to reclaim his possession, he shall receive it back on the day that he does return to the land.”

(3) How does the exile effect the land rights of deportees? The third and most critical omission of Lev 25 — when read as a “land-reclamation” text — is that it does not deal with the theological meaning of the exile *vis-à-vis* the possession of the land: was the exile a divine judgment against the land-claims of the exiles?

Certainly many non-exiled Israelites interpreted it as such. This is sufficiently clear from (the priest) Jeremiah's vision of good and bad figs:

<sup>(51)</sup> MILLER – HAYES, *History*, 446-447.

<sup>(52)</sup> Except those taken in the second deportation who actually managed to return within a year of the edict.

As with these good figs, so will I single out for good the Judean exiles whom I have driven out from this place to the land of the Chaldeans. I will look upon them favorably, and bring them back to this land ... And like the bad figs, which are so bad that they cannot be eaten, so will I treat ... the remnant of Jerusalem that is left in this land ... I will send the sword, famine, and pestilence against them until they are exterminated from the land that I gave to them and their fathers (Jer 24,5-6.8.10, NJPS).

It seems clear that Jeremiah is arguing against the inhabitants of Jerusalem who felt the exile was a judgment against those exiled, and divine vindication of themselves. Who will ultimately possess the land is one issue at stake. While the “remnant” left in the land felt as though they had been favored by God, and were justified in their appropriation of the property left by the exiles, Jeremiah insists the exiles — not those left behind — are favored by God and would ultimately inherit the land.

The contours of this debate are confirmed by Jeremiah’s younger contemporary, (the priest) Ezekiel. Ezek 11,15 records an oracle of the LORD to Ezekiel:

O mortal, [I will save] your brothers, your brothers, the men of your kindred, all of that very House of Israel to whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem say, “Keep far from the LORD; the land has been given as a heritage to us” (NJPS).

Again, we see that the inhabitants of Judah between the first and second deportations (597 BCE and 587 BCE) regarded the exiles as providentially dispossessed, and themselves as divinely authorized to occupy the land. Those left behind by the second deportation felt similarly:

O mortal, those who live in these ruins in the land of Israel argue, “Abraham was but one man, yet he was granted possession of the land. We are many; surely, the land has been given as a possession to us” (Ezek 33,23-24, NJPS).

In the following verses, Ezekiel polemicizes against the non-exiled Israelites. In agreement with Jeremiah, Ezekiel declares that God’s favor, including the right to inherit the land, lies not upon the remnant but upon the exiles.

Both the priests Ezekiel and Jeremiah, therefore, testify that there existed a debate between survivors and exiles about who had the “mandate of heaven” to possess the land. Yet the “priestly” text of Lev 25 does not address the issue. One would expect a gloss in the text such as, “If your brother Israelite is exiled to the land of your enemies,

but the LORD remembers him and brings him back to this land, you shall return to him his holding”.

A provision very similar to this, although concerning the return of a wife and not real estate, can be found in the Laws of Eshnunna:

If a man has been made prisoner during a raid or an invasion or if he has been carried off forcibly and [stayed in] a foreign [count]ry for a [long] time (and if) another man has taken his wife and she has born him a son — when he returns, he shall [get] his wife back<sup>(53)</sup>.

Here is explicit evidence that ancient Near Eastern legislators could and did take into account the possibility of a return from exile and its ramifications for property (a wife) seized in one’s absence. What would have prevented the supposed exilic priestly redactors of Lev 25 from inserting a clause like the above with “land” substituted for “wife”? Compare also the Code of Hammurabi §27:

In the case of either a private soldier of a commissary who was carried off while in the armed service of the king, if after his (disappearance) they gave his field and orchard to another and he has looked after his feudal obligations — if he has returned and reached his city, they shall restore his field and orchard to him and he shall himself look after his feudal obligations<sup>(54)</sup>.

All that was necessary for the “priests” to justify the restoration of their pre-exilic lands was to insert a line similar to LE §29 or CH §27 into their code of law and attribute it to Moses. One such line would render the entire jubilee legislation irrelevant as a means of reacquiring their lands.

Those who propose a “land-reclamation” final redaction of Lev 25 must offer an explanation for the failure of the text to address the issue of the exile in general, and particularly its effect on an Israelite’s right to his land<sup>(55)</sup>. Could it be that the priestly exilic redactors did not

<sup>(53)</sup> Laws of Eshnunna §29, *ANET* 162b; virtually identical to Code of Hammurabi §135, *ANET* 171b. Cf. also Middle Assyrian Laws §36 and §45, which state that a returned exile gets his lands back, but if he has died, the crown shall reassign them.

<sup>(54)</sup> *ANET* 167a.

<sup>(55)</sup> Fager recognizes the polemic between exiles and those left behind: “During the decade following the first deportation, it was often believed that those exiles were the ones being punished for Judah’s sins. This became more difficult to believe after the destruction of Jerusalem, yet those who remained in Palestine still made the claim that the exiles had been expelled from the cultic community (Ezek 11,14-17). Not only did this add to the exiles’ sense of alienation from the ritual that made them part of the Yahwistic community, it also seems that

realize that exile would be interpreted as a divine judgment against the land claims of the exiles? This is hardly possible, as Ezekiel realized it was an issue, and Ezekiel is closely associated with the “Holiness School” to whom the redaction of Lev 25 is generally attributed. Could it be that the fiction of Mosaic authorship prevented the redactors from attributing something as anachronistic as provisions for the exile to the text? This is unlikely, since the exile is mentioned extensively in Lev 26<sup>(56)</sup>. Could it be that the redactors were so disconnected with reality that they thought the connection between returning sold land and returning the land of exiles was obvious to all? Such an interpretation runs counter to the “land-reclamation” hypothesis, however, which tends to regard the “priests” as realistic, even cynical practitioners of *Realpolitik*<sup>(57)</sup> who forged Lev 25 as a legal fiction to justify their very real re-appropriation of land.

Thus, there seems to be no satisfactory explanation for this omission. The sole means of alienation of land mentioned in Lev 25 is sale. It does not provide instruction for rectifying alienation through other processes such as exile<sup>(58)</sup>.

---

‘participation in the cult was somehow connected with the legal right to the land’” (*Land Tenure*, 48). Despite recognizing this problem, Fager does not account for the failure of the jubilee laws to address the problem of exile *vis-à-vis* title to one’s land. Like most “land-reclamation” interpreters, Fager assumes it would have been clear to everyone that the jubilee provisions applied to loss of land through exile, even though the only type of land alienation mentioned in the text is that of sale.

<sup>(56)</sup> Interestingly, Lev 26, in its discussion of the exile, never explicitly says that the LORD will bring those exiled back to the land.

<sup>(57)</sup> Cf. RINGE, *Jesus*, 28: “The redactors of the Holiness Code, like the priests and other official leaders, appear to have approached the problems of Israel’s resettlement by concentrating on the *concrete ordinances and judgments* that would prepare the way for God’s dwelling in the midst of the people” (emphasis mine). Cf. also FAGER: “the priests were a part of the ruling class in Jerusalem, involved in financial matters of temple, and they were part of the intelligentsia of a nation in exile in a very advanced empire. It is difficult to believe that they could not have foreseen the economic stumbling blocks of the jubilee” (*Land Tenure*, 110). It is difficult to see how the jubilee can simultaneously be a piece of hard-headed, cynical *Realpolitik* (a “ploy” [GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 37]) and also utopian and impractical. See above, note 15.

<sup>(58)</sup> Cf. Gottwald’s point (as quoted in MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2243) that the jubilee legislation provided no way to settle jurisdictional disputes in the restoration.

### 3. *Other Difficulties Not Addressed by Lev 25*

In addition to the failure to deal with the significance of the exile *vis-à-vis* land claims, there are other issues not addressed in the text that would have confronted returning exiles, such as the destruction of property records and the disturbance of boundary stones. Indeed, since we have textual evidence that many families' genealogical records had been lost or destroyed (Ezra 2,62), it is a small leap to suppose that property records were in a similar state. Moreover, since most of those who were adults at the time of deportation would have died in exile, the vast majority of those who returned would have been at best children when deported. More commonly, they would have been born and raised in exile, never having seen their ancestral land, and therefore not knowing its location or boundaries. Again, Lev 25 would have been no help in this regard. The right to return to one's property does little good if one does not know where one's property is or what its boundaries are<sup>(59)</sup>.

## IV. A Comparison with Ezekiel

To get a proper perspective on the true nature of the legislation of Lev 25, it is useful to compare it with a vision of land reform for which we have firmer evidence to believe was written in the exile, by a priest or priestly circle closely associated with the Holiness School, with the intent of providing regulations for the restoration: Ezek 45–48<sup>(60)</sup>.

Ezekiel<sup>(61)</sup> realized that the confusion over land title caused by

<sup>(59)</sup> One could argue that "the priests" did not foresee these difficulties, but cf. FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 110, quoted above, note 57.

<sup>(60)</sup> Ezekiel 40–48 has been — and continues to be (e.g. BIANCHI, "Jobeljahr", 88) — attributed to late post-exilic redactors. However, since it was the Torah of Moses and not the Torah of Ezekiel that was considered authoritative in the restoration period (cf. H. NAJMAN, *Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* [Leiden, forthcoming]), it is difficult to imagine what if any motivation could have existed to retroject unrealistic laws into Ezekiel's mouth in, e.g., the fifth century BCE. For the attribution of Ezek 40–48 to the prophet himself, see M. GREENBERG, "The Design and Themes of Ezekiel's Program of Restoration [Ezek 40–48]", *Int* 38 (1984) 181–208. W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 2* (trans. J.D. MARTIN; ed. P.D. HANSON – L.J. GREENSPOON) (Philadelphia 1983) 547–55, thinks these chapters reached substantially their final form at the hands of Ezekiel's disciples at about the time of the initial return from exile. On the authorship and exilic dating of Ezekiel, see above, note 1.

<sup>(61)</sup> We follow Greenberg in attributing Ezek 40–48 to the prophet. However, even if the material was augmented by his disciples into the period of the initial return, as held by Zimmerli (see previous note), the arguments presented here

multiple deportations, opportunistic appropriations, and the influx of foreign settlers in the exile rendered completely unworkable a simplistic return to pre-exilic land possessions. Moreover, the priest Ezekiel, so closely associated with the Holiness School<sup>(62)</sup>, did not approve of the way the land was distributed before the exile (45,7-9; 46,16-18), his biggest complaint being the expropriation of private lands by the royal house<sup>(63)</sup>.

What was needed was a fresh start, an entirely new re-allocation of the land. This is what Ezekiel provides, giving extensive instructions for the redistribution of the land (Ezek 45,1-8; 47,13-48,29) according to the tribes of Israel, giving the borders (47,15-20), *explicit* authorization to reallocate the land (47,21-22), provision for the foreigners that had been settled in it by Assyria and Babylon (47,22-23); and including space for the Levites (45,5; 48,13-14), the priests (45,3-4; 48,9-12), the sanctuary (45,2; 48,8), the holy city (45,1; 48,15-20) and the royal house (45,7-8; 48,21-22).

Interestingly, so far from desiring the return of lands to the priests themselves, the priest Ezekiel forbids the possession of lands to the priests (Ezek 44,28-31). He knows of the jubilee, mentioning it in

---

would still be valid. One would only need to replace the name "Ezekiel" with "the Ezekielian school" in the text below. What is pertinent to the argument is only that Ezek 40-48 represents the perspective of a priest or priestly circle in the exile, not that it comes from the prophet so named.

<sup>(62)</sup> On Ezekiel's relationship with the Holiness School, see above, note 1.

<sup>(63)</sup> Ezekiel's testimony on this point is particularly interesting, because an unspoken and unsubstantiated assumption of the "land-reclamation" hypothesis is that "the priests" were in favor of the land distribution situation prior to the exile and wanted to return to it. However, it seems quite plain from the scriptural texts from the late pre-exilic and exilic period that land was *not* distributed with equity (cf. Isa 5,8; Mic 2,2; Ezek 34,17-22; 46,18; cf. Gottwald as quoted in MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2243). Why would the priests want to restore this situation of inequity? Perhaps the very cynical position could be advanced that, despite appearances, the purpose of the jubilee legislation was *not* to restore equity but to restore the *inequity* of land distribution before the exile, which benefited the priests and the other returning exiles. However, Ezekiel witnesses to a different attitude among the priests. Moreover, interpretations that posit such economically self-serving interests as the motivation for the jubilee legislation's final form cannot be maintained when the text is studied at length. Fager, who favors a modified "land-reclamation" hypothesis, still concludes, "The Jubilee rested upon the assumption that all Israelites were attached to family land allotted to the several families at the time of the conquest of Canaan; therefore there was the basic presupposition that God willed all Israelites to have a relatively equal opportunity to share in the richness of the land" (*Land Tenure*, 110).



passing (Ezek 46,16-18)<sup>(64)</sup>, but for him it is a provision for periodic restoration of ancestral land, not a blueprint for post-exilic reallocation.

The problems attending any use of Lev 25 as a blue-print for land restoration in the post-exilic period do not pertain to Ezekiel's vision. He does not single out "inhabitants" as the subject of his legislation, nor is urban property excluded from distribution. The problems of when to hold a jubilee, what do if one is missed, and the implications of the exile *vis-à-vis* land claims do not apply: the people are authorized to divide up the land completely anew, respecting the ancient tradition of distribution by tribe (and presumably smaller family units), but not bound to a now-irrecoverable state of affairs obtaining in previous generations.

Ezekiel's vision of land redistribution looks like — and claims to be — a blueprint for the restoration of Israel's land, written by a priest (or priestly school) in the Holiness tradition in the exile. While the restoration did not take the exact form Ezekiel envisioned<sup>(65)</sup>, and

<sup>(64)</sup> On Ezekiel's knowledge of the jubilee, cf. the comments on Ezek 46,17 by G.A. COOKE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1936), 512-513: "*the year of release* is referred to here as an established institution needing no comment ..."; likewise H. WILDBERGER, "Israel und sein Land", *EvTh* 16 (1956) 415: "Jedenfalls beweisen die Ezechielstellen, daß das Jahr der Freilassen im alten Israel eine bekannte Ordnung gewesen ist"; and W. ZIMMERLI, "Das 'Gnadenjahr des Herrn'", *Archäologie und Altes Testament*. Festschrift für Kurt Galling zum 8. Jan. 1970 (ed. A. KUSCHKE – E. KUTSCH) (Tübingen 1970) 328: "[I]n diesem wohl in der Exilszeit entstanden Gesetze [wird] diese Institution ganz selbstverständlich vorausgesetzt. Nichts deutet daraufhin, daß sie hier erst durchgekämpft werden mußte." It should be noted that in the opinion of ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel* 2, 346-247; GREENBERG, "Design and Themes", 190; and J.D. LEVENSON, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48* (HSM 10; Missoula, MT 1976) 18, the "twenty-fifth year of our exile" (Ezek 40,1) in which the temple vision occurred indicates the half-way point of a jubilee cycle beginning in 597 BCE, at the end of which (547 BCE) the prophet anticipated the restoration of Israel. If this is the case, then the forty-nine/fifty-year period of the jubilee was already established in the exile, thus invalidating the land-reclamation hypothesis. The date formula of Ezek 40,1 cannot be a post-exilic retrojection placing Ezekiel's vision at the half-way point of a "jubilee" cycle construed as 587-538 BCE, because Ezekiel dates the "twenty-fifth year" from the first deportation.

<sup>(65)</sup> Ezekiel seems to have expected larger numbers of returning exiles, including representatives of the Northern tribes dispersed more than a hundred years earlier. In fact, only relatively small numbers of Israelites took up Cyrus' offer to return, and these were mostly Judeans. Nor was the entire land of Israel restored, but only a reduced Judah.

some of his provisions are impractical in hindsight<sup>(66)</sup>, at least he deals with the issues that exiles would have anticipated facing. Lev 25, on the other hand, does not look like a plan for the reallocation of land after the exile, and does not look like it has been redacted for this purpose. It does not resolve the issues that the returning exiles could have anticipated facing.

\*  
\* \* \*

This paper has examined the hypothesis that the final redaction of Lev 25 was performed by “the priests” in the post-exilic period with the intent to provide legal justification for the repossession of their lands and those of the other exiles. This hypothesis has been found inadequate to explain the final form of Lev 25. Not only do certain features of the text — such as its mention of “inhabitants” and the ban on the return of urban property — conflict with the interests of the returning exiles, but major issues that the exiles would have faced in regaining their lands are not addressed at all, such as when to hold a jubilee, what to do if one is missed, and whether the jubilee provisions cover alienation of land due to exile. Comparison of Lev 25 with the land reform legislation of Ezekiel highlights the differences between Lev 25 and actual priestly laws aimed at the restoration of land after the exile.

100 University Village #E2  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, Indiana

John Sietze BERGSMA

### SUMMARY

The article examines the hypothesis that the jubilee legislation of Lev 25 was a post-exilic attempt on the part of returning Judean exiles — particularly the priests — to provide legal justification for the reclamation of their former lands. This hypothesis is found to be dubious because (1) the jubilee did not serve the interests of the socio-economic classes that were exiled, and (2) Lev 25 does not show signs of having been redacted with the post-exilic situation in mind. A comparison with Ezekiel’s vision of restoration points out the differences between Lev 25 and actual priestly land legislation for the post-exilic period.

<sup>(66)</sup> Ezekiel had a mental picture of Israel with Jerusalem in its geographic center. His redistribution is based on such a view. Cf. LEVENSON, *Theology*, 115-118.

## **The Jubilee: A Post-Exilic Priestly Attempt to Reclaim Lands?**

Traditionally, the jubilee year of Leviticus 25 has been viewed as priestly legislation aimed at ensuring the perpetual land-rights of the small landowner and his descendants by preventing latifundism — the accumulation of large estates by the wealthy. In recent scholarship on this chapter, however, a different view of the intent of the jubilee legislation has gained popularity. This view regards the jubilee legislation as the production of exilic or post-exilic priests, with the intent to justify legally the repossession of lands lost in the exile by themselves and other returning Judean exiles. For lack of a better term, this view may be called the “land-reclamation” hypothesis.

This paper attempts to open discussion on the “land-reclamation” hypothesis, asking whether it is capable of explaining the presence or absence of various features in Lev 25. The issue of the dating of the final redaction of the text, though interesting in itself and pertinent to the subject, is not the main focus of this paper<sup>(1)</sup>: the only question is

<sup>(1)</sup> Of course, if it could be established that the Holiness Code is a product of the pre-exilic period, it would invalidate the “land-reclamation” hypothesis. Some recent scholarship presents arguments for a pre-exilic dating, e.g. I. KNOHL, *The Sanctuary of Silence*. The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School (Minneapolis 1995) 199-224, esp. 207-209; J. JOOSTEN, *People and Land in the Holiness Code*. An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26 (VTS 67; Leiden 1996) 84-92; and J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 17–22*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 3A; New York 2000) 1361-1364; ID., “Does H Advocate the Centralization of Worship?”, *JSOT* 88 (2000) 59-76, all of whom argue for a setting in the monarchic period. To the contrary K. GRÜN WALDT, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17–26*. Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie (BZAW 271; Berlin 1999) 375-381, defends the position that H is late-exilic. Grünwaldt argues in part from the dependence of H on exilic biblical texts. However, the direction of dependence is not unambiguous. For example, on the crucial issue of the relationship of Ezekiel to H, some recent scholarship argues strongly for the priority of H, e.g. R.L. KOHN, “A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah” (Ph.D. Dissertation; University of California, San Diego, 1997); ID., “Ezekiel, the Exile, and the Torah”, *Society of Biblical Literature 1999 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 38; Atlanta 1999) 501-526; ID., “A Prophet Like Moses? Rethinking Ezekiel’s Relationship to the Torah”, *ZAW* 114 (2002) 236-254; J. MILGROM, “Leviticus 26 and Ezekiel”, *The Quest for Context and Meaning*. Studies in

whether the repossession of lands by the returning exiles *motivated* the redaction. The paper concludes that there are some impediments to accepting the “land-reclamation” hypothesis: (1) the jubilee legislation in its final form did not serve the interests of returning exiles, whether priestly or lay; and (2) the text betrays few signs of having been redacted or augmented with a “land-reclamation” agenda. A comparison of Lev 25 with the vision of land allocation in Ezek 45–48 underscores the differences between the jubilee legislation and what is widely regarded as an actual exilic priestly blueprint for the redistribution of land.

### I. A Brief History of Scholarship on the Subject

The first biblical scholar to suggest that the jubilee legislation was redacted with the intent to justify the recovery of lands by the returning exiles seems to have been Gerhard Wallis in 1969. He summarizes his approach in an English abstract appended to his article “Das Jubeljahr-Gesetz, eine Novelle zum Sabbathjahr Gesetz”:

---

Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders (ed. C.A. EVANS – S. TALMON) (Leiden 1997) 57–62; *id.*, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1362. For older scholarship arguing Ezekiel’s dependence on H, see A. KLOSTERMANN, “Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs”, *ZLThK* 38 (1877) 401–445; and H.G. REVENTLOW, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht* (WMANT 6; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1961) esp. 30; but also L. HORST, *Leviticus xvii–xxvi und Hezekiel. Ein Beitrag zur Pentateuchkritik* (Colmar 1881); L.E. ELLIOT–BINNS, “Some Problems of the Holiness Code”, *ZAW* 67 (1955) 26–40. Binns and Horst regard H as having been available to Ezekiel, but as uncompiled, independent traditions. The relationship of H to Ezekiel is significant: since much or all of Ezekiel appears exilic, Ezekiel’s dependence on H would indicate a pre-exilic date for the latter. On the exilic dating of much or all of Ezekiel, see W. ZIMMERLI, “The Special Form- and Traditio-historical Character of Ezekiel’s Prophecy”, *VT* 15 (1965) 515–516; L. BOADT, *Ezekiel’s Oracles against Egypt* (BibOr 37; Rome 1980); B. LANG, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem. Die Politik des Propheten Ezechiel* (SBB; Stuttgart 1981); W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 1* (trans. R.E. CLEMENTS) (Philadelphia 1983) 68–73; M. GREENBERG, *Ezekiel 1–20* (AB 22; New York 1983) 18–27; *id.*, “What Are Valid Criteria for Determining Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?”, *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. J. LUST) (Leuven 1986) 123–135; T. COLLINS, *The Mantle of Elijah. The Redactional Criticism of the Prophetic Books* (BiSe 20; Sheffield 1993) 91–93; E.F. DAVIS, *Swallowing the Scroll. Textuality and the Dynamics of Discourse in Ezekiel’s Prophecy* (JSOTSS 78; Sheffield 1989); L.C. ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; Dallas 1986) XXIV–XXVI; and D.I. BLOCK, *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24* (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1997) 17–23.

This Law of the Jubilee originates from the later exilic times and should open to the people returning from the exile the possibility of regaining in the homeland the rights of land-owning, which probably had been lost during the years of their absence<sup>(2)</sup>.

Wallis also argues that the interval of forty-nine years "means" either the time between the first deportation (597 BCE) and Second Isaiah (548 BCE) or between the second deportation (587 BCE) and the edict of Cyrus (538 BCE).

Wallis's suggestion was taken up by several important scholars of the jubilee legislation and related texts, such as Innocenzo Cardellini (1981)<sup>(3)</sup>, Baruch Levine (1983)<sup>(4)</sup>, and Sharon Ringe (1985):

The new compilation [of the Holiness Code] would resolve a major problem accompanying the people's return from the exile, namely, the allocation and subsequent management of the land<sup>(5)</sup>.

Interpretations along similar lines were offered by Marvin Chaney (1991)<sup>(6)</sup>, Jeffrey Fager (1993)<sup>(7)</sup>, Norman C. Habel (1995)<sup>(8)</sup>, and most notably, Norman K. Gottwald:

The jubilee programme can thus be viewed as the political and economic ploy of the Aaronid priests to achieve leadership in restored Judah by dispensing benefits to a wide swath of the populace, presumably with the civil and military support from the Persians<sup>(9)</sup>.

<sup>(2)</sup> G. WALLIS, "Das Jubeljahr-Gesetz, eine Novelle zum Sabbathjahr-Gesetz", *MIOF* 5 (1969) 344-345.

<sup>(3)</sup> I. CARDELLINI, *Die biblischen "Sklaven"-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts*. Ein Beitrag zur Tradition, Überlieferung und Redaktion der alttestamentlichen Rechtstexte (BBB 55; Bonn 1981) 363-375.

<sup>(4)</sup> B.A. LEVINE, "Late Language in the Priestly Source: Some Literary and Historical Observations", *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem Aug 16-21, 1981*. Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Hebrew Language (ed. D. KRONE) (Jerusalem 1983) 69-82.

<sup>(5)</sup> S.H. RINGE, *Jesus, Liberation, and the Biblical Jubilee*. Images for Ethics and Christology (Overtures to Biblical Theology 19; Philadelphia 1985) 26.

<sup>(6)</sup> M.L. CHANEY, "Debt Easement in Israelite History and Tradition", *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis*. Essays in Honor of Norman K. Gottwald on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (ed. D. JOBLING et al.) (Cleveland 1991) 127-139, esp. 138-139.

<sup>(7)</sup> J.A. FAGER, *Land Tenure and the Biblical Jubilee*. Uncovering Hebrew Ethics through the Sociology of Knowledge (JSOTSS 155; Sheffield 1993) 60-63.

<sup>(8)</sup> N.C. HABEL, *The Land is Mine*. Six Biblical Land Ideologies (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Minneapolis 1995) 97-114, esp. 113.

<sup>(9)</sup> N.K. GOTTWALD, "The Biblical Jubilee: In Whose Interests?", *The Jubilee Challenge: Utopia or Possibility?* (ed. H. UCKO) (Geneva 1997) 37. Gottwald

However, according to Jacob Milgrom, Gottwald apparently no longer advocates this position<sup>(10)</sup>.

Nonetheless, this stream of interpretation has apparently become powerful enough to sway Klaus Grünwaldt<sup>(11)</sup>, Francesco Bianchi<sup>(12)</sup>, and perhaps the greatest scholar of the jubilee, Robert G. North, who has recently revised his original settlement-era dating of the jubilee legislation<sup>(13)</sup>:

[We] feel securely within the competent majority in claiming that the Jubilee-decree itself was the last part of Lev 25 to be composed, near the end of the Exile and in view of repossessing Judah [*sic*] lands, though quite possibly retrieving a similar proposal from as early as the Joshua-settlement era<sup>(14)</sup>.

Most of these scholars are somewhat vague about how the jubilee legislation would have functioned practically in a land dispute between

---

does not flesh out his proposal further. Is it really true that a return to the land distribution situation of 587 BCE would please those living in Yehud in the 530's? Isn't it just as likely that such a move would alienate all those who had not been exiled, and even some who had? What would be done with lands formerly owned by the crown or by people who had died or decided not to return from Babylon? How confident can one be that the Aaronid priests had the civil and military support of the Persians in the early (pre-Ezra) post-exilic period? If the redaction of the jubilee legislation is placed in the exile, a certain lack of correspondence between the legislation and the actual post-exilic situation can be excused, since the redactors did not know exactly how the restoration would take shape. By placing the redaction among the priests "on the ground" in post-exilic Yehud, Gottwald makes it harder for himself to explain the lack of correspondence between the jubilee and actual post-exilic conditions.

<sup>(10)</sup> J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 23–27. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3B; New York 2001) 2242–2243.

<sup>(11)</sup> GRÜN WALDT, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 380–381.

<sup>(12)</sup> F. BIANCHI, "Das Jubeljahr in der hebräischen Bibel und in den nachkanonischen jüdischen Texten", *Das Jubeljahr im Wandel. Untersuchungen zu Erlaßjahr- und Jubeljahrtexten aus vier Jahrtausenden* (ed. G. SCHEUERMANN) (FZB 94; Würzburg 2000) 55–104, esp. 84–89. Bianchi places Lev 25 in the very late 6<sup>th</sup> century, without responding to the arguments of KNOHL (*Sanctuary*, 199–224) and JOOSTEN (*People and Land*, 84–92) for a substantially pre-exilic H. Milgrom's position on the jubilee (*Leviticus 23–27*, 2241–2257) would have been unavailable to him.

<sup>(13)</sup> For North's original position, see R.G. NORTH, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee* (AnBib 4; Rome 1954), 212, et passim.

<sup>(14)</sup> R.G. NORTH, *The Biblical Jubilee ... After Fifty Years* (AnBib 145; Rome 2000) 114. North makes similar comments on pp. 11–12, 18, 19, 31, 82, 83, 97, 103, 108, 112, 113. (But see p. 98, where he equivocates, seemingly re-affirming his 1954 position).

returning exiles and non-exiled Israelites<sup>(15)</sup>. Was Lev 25 meant as binding law to be produced in court to verify one's land rights? Or was it only for "internal" use, to provide intellectual reasoning for those who already believed in the priests' and exiles' position? Lack of specificity on matters like this makes the hypothesis difficult to subject to analysis. Moreover, the different proponents of this same general position differ among themselves in the specifics they do supply. For example, some scholars argue that the legislation was produced in early restoration Judea<sup>(16)</sup>, while others insist a post-exilic redaction is impossible due to the lack of correspondence between the jubilee legislation and the actual restoration situation<sup>(17)</sup>.

No direct evidence — biblical or extra-biblical, textual or archeological — has yet been produced to substantiate this hypothesis<sup>(18)</sup>. Our sources do not indicate that the exiles attempted to regain ancestral lands upon their return and met opposition, much less that Lev 25 was put forward as a legal basis for such an attempt. The sources do not even indicate that the exiles made a serious attempt to return to the exact property held by their ancestors<sup>(19)</sup>. Therefore, the

<sup>(15)</sup> A case in point is the position of Cardellini, who seems to vacillate between viewing Lev 25 as earnest legislation and as utopian vision. On the one hand he states, "der Text verlangt zwingend eine konkrete Basis, weil er konkrete Bestimmungen enthält [wurde]" (369), but on the other, "das Jubeljahr schon von Anfang an nicht als wirksame rechtliche Vorschrift verstanden wurde" (374). Likewise, Bianchi (*Jobeljahr*, 84-89), despite an extensive discussion of the social history of early post-exilic Judah, never describes how or by whom exactly the jubilee was *supposed* to have been promulgated and implemented, although he is confident it never was. In our opinion, this vagueness on the part of scholars as to the exact nature and intention of Lev 25 arises from the fact that the legislation cannot quite be made to fit the post-exilic situation.

<sup>(16)</sup> GOTTWALD, "Jubilee", 37; CHANEY, "Debt-Easement", 138-139.

<sup>(17)</sup> WALLIS, "Jobeljahr-Gesetz", 344; also Gottwald as quoted in MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2242-2243.

<sup>(18)</sup> Interestingly, in the opinion of, e.g., Bianchi, the lack of any evidence of the observation of the jubilee in the monarchic period rules out the possibility of a pre-exilic setting of Lev 25 ("Jobeljahr", 83); but the same lack of evidence for the post-exilic period is explained by the fact that the reform movement represented by Lev 25 was abortive ("Jobeljahr", 87-88). Thus, silence means different things in the pre- and post-exilic periods.

<sup>(19)</sup> In Ezra 2,3-35, some of the returning Israelites are identified not by their ancestor but by their ancestral town. Ezra 2,70 simply reports that the Israelites "took up residence in their towns." If there was opposition to their resettlement, or a contested attempt on the part of exiles to reclaim family estates from before the exile, it is not reflected in this text. Neither do Haggai or Zechariah reflect such a situation. Neh 11,1 indicates that the resettlement of Jerusalem took place

hypothesis of a “land-reclamation” redaction of Lev 25 remains, in the words of Norman Gottwald, purely an “exercise in historical imagination”<sup>(20)</sup>. That does not necessarily mean it is false, only unsubstantiated. It is fair to ask, however, whether the hypothesis does indeed meet even the standards of “historical imagination”.

## II. Does the Jubilee Legislation Serve the Interests of the Returning Exiles?

### 1. *Who Benefited from the Jubilee?*

A common assumption of the “land-reclamation” hypothesis is that the jubilee legislation served the interests of the returning exiles. In order to examine this assumption critically, it is necessary to ascertain (1) which socio-economic groups benefited from the jubilee, and (2) which socio-economic groups were exiled.

Although many points of interpretation of the jubilee are hotly debated, there is remarkable unanimity concerning the beneficiaries of the legislation. The two scholars who have devoted monographs to the subject in the past fifty years — North and Fager — are in agreement:

It would be more directly evident ... that the whole concern of Lev 25 is with the independent small farmer ...<sup>(21)</sup>.

Since the purpose of the jubilee seems to have been to preserve the economic integrity of the peasant farmer, there was no need to protect urban property from alienation<sup>(22)</sup>.

---

by lot, i.e. apparently with disregard for pre-exilic property assignments. Jer 32,6-15 may testify to a pre-exilic hope that exact property titles would be restored. On the other hand, Ezek 47,13-48,29 gives instructions for a completely new post-exilic re-allotment of land which abolishes pre-exilic boundaries.

<sup>(20)</sup> GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 38. It would seem that, since the need to regain lands for the exiles turned out not to be an issue, if one presumes the land-reclamation hypothesis for the final redaction of Lev 25, then the *terminus ad quem* for this redaction would be the initial return of the exiles under Cyrus. After that time, it would be clear to all that the issue was moot. Before this time, it might be imagined that priests in the exile thought there would be a larger population of returning exiles and more resistance from those who had settled on the land in the meantime, such that they would anticipate a conflict over land and thus a need for legislation authorizing the restoration of the exiles’ property. Proposals for a land-reclamation redaction by *post-exilic* priests are not realistic, since there is no historical evidence that any such conflict over an attempt to regain pre-exilic lands — which *exilic* priests may have anticipated — actually developed. Cf. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2242-2243.

<sup>(21)</sup> NORTH, *After Fifty Years*, 34.

<sup>(22)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 88-89.



North also adds that “a flourishing commercial orientation [is] quite different from the petty-agriculture focus with which most of the jubilee chapter deals”<sup>(23)</sup>. Similar views on the focus and beneficiaries of the legislation are expressed by Habel<sup>(24)</sup>, Gottwald<sup>(25)</sup>, Albrecht<sup>(26)</sup>, and Milgrom<sup>(27)</sup>.

If the beneficiaries of the jubilee are the “independent” or “peasant” farmers, what socio-economic classes were exiled? According to the deuteronomistic historian, the classes taken into exile at the first deportation were the royal court, the “notables” (אֲדָרָאִים), the military, craftsmen, and smiths — about 10,000 in all (2 Kgs 24,13-17). At the second deportation, the “remnant of the population” of Jerusalem was taken (2 Kgs 25,11), including “what remained of the craftsmen” (Jer 52,15). In both deportations, “the poorest people in the land” were left “to be vinedressers and field hands” (2 Kgs 24,14; 25,12; Jer 52,15-16).

Thus, according to the deuteronomistic historian(s), the exiles were the urban elite, *not* the rural farming class whom the jubilee legislation was designed to protect. The first deportation, in 597 BCE, was certainly the most significant in quantity and “quality” of people. In the second, the “urban elite” was considerably smaller (cf. Jer 52,28-30). The non-exiled “poorest people of the land” almost certainly would have included the “small independent farmers” who would benefit from the jubilee legislation<sup>(28)</sup>.

<sup>(23)</sup> NORTH, *After Fifty Years*, 58.

<sup>(24)</sup> HABEL, *The Land*, 97, 111, 112 — “There is a strong concern in this proposed social order to preserve the traditional landholdings of the peasants and maintain their independence over against rich landowners”, 113 — “The ideal of the peasant society depicted in Leviticus 25–27 is that peasant farmers will be completely free from domination by the urban elite.”

<sup>(25)</sup> GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 35. Although ultimately Gottwald argues that “the priests” put forward the jubilee legislation in their own interests, the priests’ interests are tied to the fact that the legislation would “dispense benefits to a wide swath of the population” (37).

<sup>(26)</sup> “Hence the degressive cancellation of debt within the period of the Year of Jubilee should very much be understood as a serious attempt to restructure economic laws for the sake of preventing small farmers from falling ever more deeply into debt” (R. ALBRECHT, *Der Mensch als Hüter seiner Welt* [Stuttgart 1990] 53; trans. in E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus* [OTL; Louisville 1993] 380).

<sup>(27)</sup> MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2243, and elsewhere.

<sup>(28)</sup> It is interesting to note the mention of the “remnant” working the vineyards and fields (2 Kgs 25,12; Jer 52,15-16), since vineyards and fields are mentioned together several times in Lev 25 (vv. 3-5.11).

Of course, the accuracy and agenda of the deuteronomistic historian and the redactor of Jeremiah have been challenged<sup>(29)</sup>, but these challenges do not effect the present argument, since — at least to our knowledge — no one disputes the fact that the deportees consisted of the urban upper classes, i.e. those who would pose a potential political threat to Babylonian rule<sup>(30)</sup>. This is congruent with known Babylonian policy. As Martin Noth describes it,

After the old upper class in Jerusalem and Judah had been taken away in 598 B.C., mainly the urban population of Jerusalem was deported [in 587 B.C.], presumably again to Babylonia. The peasant population, on the other hand, remained where they were<sup>(31)</sup>.

The urban character of the exiled population is hard to reconcile with the exception of urban property from the jubilee laws, if the legislation was produced or redacted to benefit them. Lev 25,29-34 excludes the sale of houses within cities from the release of the jubilee, with the exception of *levitical* property in *levitical cities*, which Jerusalem was not (cf. 1 Chr 6,34-66). Why would the returning “priests” specifically forbid to themselves and the other exiles the opportunity to recover their urban residences? Why does the exception for levitical property not include Jerusalem? This is particularly ironic, given the fact that a large number of the exiles were Jerusalemites.

In sum, the problem for the “land-reclamation” hypothesis is this: “the purpose of the jubilee seems to have been to preserve the economic integrity of the peasant farmer”<sup>(32)</sup> the very segment of the population *not* exiled. The exiles were the urban elite who benefited from the system of latifundism expressly opposed by the jubilee<sup>(33)</sup>. How then is the jubilee legislation a product or redaction of the

<sup>(29)</sup> See, e.g. R.P. CARROLL, “The Myth of the Empty Land”, *Semeia* 59 (1992) 79-93, and H.M. BARSTAD, *The Myth of the Empty Land. A Study in the History and Archeology of Judah During the “Exilic” Period* (SO.S 28; Oslo 1996). Although challenging other aspects of the biblical presentation of the exile, Barstad concurs that the exiles were “Judahite elites.”

<sup>(30)</sup> See M. NOTH, *The History of Israel* (New York 1960) 282, 287; J.M. MILLER – J. H. HAYES, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Philadelphia 1986) 420, 424; and J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel* (Louisville 2000) 327-328, 331, 345.

<sup>(31)</sup> NOTH, *History*, 287.

<sup>(32)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 88-89.

<sup>(33)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 85: “Such a power structure [i.e. latifundism] benefited the urban classes and the wealthy creditors who were able to accumulate large landholdings and keep the peasants in a dependent status”.

interests of the returning exiles, priestly or lay? Realizing this, Habel even suggests the non-exiled rural population as a possible *Sitz-im-Leben* for the origin of the jubilee legislation<sup>(34)</sup>.

## 2. The “Inhabitants”?

There is also phraseology in Lev 25 that would be particularly awkward for returning urban exiles. Lev 25,10 mandates “You shall proclaim release throughout the land for all *its inhabitants* [יְשִׁבֵּיהָ].” This wording would have the potential to backfire against the exiles, who in fact were not “inhabitants” of the land, and largely had not been for more than sixty years<sup>(35)</sup>. Ironically, it would favor those whose lands the exiles wished to repossess, especially since — as we will demonstrate below — the inhabitants of the land regarded themselves as having been confirmed in their right to the land by the divine action of the exile<sup>(36)</sup>. If the text was augmented or redacted for post-exilic “land-reclamation” purposes, we would expect יְשִׁבֵּיהָ to be replaced with something more generic, such as בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל.

## 3. The “Priests”?

But perhaps it was not the exiled population *per se* that was meant to benefit from the jubilee, but only the priestly caste. This position has been put forward forcefully by Ringe:

The priestly compilers of the laws ... would not only have established their own authority over the regulation of the land and its inhabitants, but at the same time would have legitimized their administration by a reaffirmation of its basis in God’s sovereignty. The religious sanction that such legislation would have lent to their authority would have been crucial in the consolidation of their power and in the establishment of the holy and righteous people under God which was their aim<sup>(37)</sup>.

<sup>(34)</sup> HABEL, *The Land*, 113.

<sup>(35)</sup> As will be discussed further below, the period from the second deportation to the edict of Cyrus was about forty-nine years. However, most of the exiles were taken in the first deportation (597 BCE), *fifty-nine* years before the edict of Cyrus. And it cannot be taken for granted that even Sheshbazzar’s expedition — if indeed he led one — returned within a year of the edict.

<sup>(36)</sup> Interestingly, Ezekiel uses virtually the same word (יָשַׁב) as Lev 25,10 to refer to those *left behind* by the second deportation (Ezek 11,15), as opposed to the exiles.

<sup>(37)</sup> RINGE, *Jesus*, 26-27.

Similar views can be found in Habel<sup>(38)</sup> and Gottwald<sup>(39)</sup>. However, Fager, while holding that “the priests” may have benefited from receiving back some land, sufficiently points out the inadequacy of this kind of argument:

There are those who believe the jubilee actually bestowed power on the priests through its control of land distribution ... However, the jubilee worked automatically, independent from priestly prerogatives, and it tended to maintain a relatively equal distribution of land, dispersing economic power widely. At most, the priests may have wanted to establish the returning exiles’ right to their ‘fair share’ of the land; however, had they wanted control of the distribution of the land, they could have stated that explicitly in the legislation; the simple presence of the jubilee in the Priestly Code does not express a grab for power by the priests<sup>(40)</sup>.

### III. Does the Jubilee Legislation Show Signs of a “Land-reclamation” Redaction?

One weakness of the “land-reclamation” hypothesis is that nothing in Lev 25 requires it for explanation. Indeed, prior to Wallis (1969), commentators such as Wellhausen, Kuenen, Eerdmans, Ginzberg, Albright, Jirku, Eichrodt, Noth, and Snaith found it unnecessary to

<sup>(38)</sup> HABEL, *The Land*, 111-112.

<sup>(39)</sup> GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 36-37.

<sup>(40)</sup> FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 99. Habel gives an additional twist to the argument rejected by Fager. He believes that since gifts of land to the LORD — if not redeemed before the jubilee — became the permanent property of the priests (Lev 27,20-21), therefore the legislation gave the priests higher social standing, since they alone were able progressively to gain land (HABEL, *The Land*, 110-113). Two things count against this argument, however. First, the priests, as a subset of Levites, were barred from owning land, a fact implied by Lev 25,32-34 (cf. NOTH, *Leviticus*, 190-191; MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2201) and acknowledged elsewhere in the Bible (Num 35,2-3; Deut 18,1; Josh 14,4; Ezek 44,28-31). Lev 27,20-21 is an exceptional case in which they needed to administer property belonging to the sanctuary. Would this exception really be enough to offset their general landlessness, such that they would attain greater “social standing”? Secondly, the priests had no coercive power to gain land. They were entirely passive in the transaction of Lev 27,20-21, dependent on the good will of individual Israelites who may have wanted to devote part of their ancestral property to God. Even then, it was only if the land was never redeemed before the jubilee that it passed to priestly hands. Is this a scheme to aggrandize and enrich the priesthood? Surely better and easier ones could be devised, if that were the intent. “The priests” could have simply written in an exception for themselves to buy and sell land without being subject to the jubilee.

have recourse to such a hypothesis<sup>(41)</sup>. Subsequent commentators such as Porter, Wenham, Gerstenberger, Hartley, and Milgrom have felt similarly uncompelled<sup>(42)</sup>.

The “land-reclamation” perspective does not have a particular heuristic value, such that upon accepting it, details of the text that were obscure suddenly become meaningful. Rather, the opposite is the case. If the final redaction was a post-exilic power-play for the repossession of real estate, then the extensive instructions regarding the alleviation of debt-slavery in vv. 23-55 — most of the textual unit — become irrelevant to the intent of the final redaction, and thus a distraction from — rather than an indication of — the central thrust of the text.

### 1. *The Forty-nine Years*

One aspect of the text that the “land-reclamation” hypothesis claims to explain is the forty-nine-year duration of the jubilee cycle. Frequently it is asserted that the period between jubilees was somehow inspired by the forty-nine years between the second deportation (587 BCE) and the edict of Cyrus (538 BCE). In other words, the returning priests established the jubilee period at forty-nine years in order to justify, upon their return in 538 BCE, the restoration of land ownership to the situation in 587 BCE. However, this assertion is both implausible and unnecessary, for the following reasons:

(1) According to both the deuteronomistic historian (2 Kgs 24,14-17; 25,11) and the book of Jeremiah (Jer 52,28-30), a much larger group of exiles was deported in 597 BCE than in 587 BCE<sup>(43)</sup>. If the

<sup>(41)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, “Pentateuch and Joshua”, *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Edinburgh 1885) XVII, 513; A. KUENEN, *Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* (London 1886); B.D. EERDMANS, *Das Buch Leviticus* (Alttestamentliche Studien IV; Giessen 1912); E. GINZBERG, “Studies in the Economics of the Bible”, *JQR* 22 (1932) 343-408; W.F. ALBRIGHT, *Archeology of Palestine and the Bible* (New York 1933) 156; A. JIRKU, “Das israelitische Jubeljahr”, *Seeberg-Festschrift* (Leipzig 1929) II, 169-179; W. EICHRODT, “Religionsgeschichte Israels”, *Historia Mundi* (ed. F. Kern – F. Valjavec) (Bern 1953) II, 385; M. NOTH, *Leviticus* (trans. J.E. ANDERSON) (OTL; London 1965); N.H. SNAITH, *Leviticus and Numbers* (CeB; London 1967).

<sup>(42)</sup> J.R. PORTER, *Leviticus* (London 1976); G.J. WENHAM, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids 1979); J.E. HARTLEY, *Leviticus* (WBC; Dallas 1992); E.S. GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus* (OTL; Louisville 1993); MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27.

<sup>(43)</sup> According to Jer 52,28, the first deportation was more than three times larger than the second. It could be argued that these figures are inaccurate. However, it must be acknowledged that 2 Kgs 24,14-17; 25,11; and Jer 52,28-30

impression given by these sources is even approximately correct, any attempt on the part of the returnees shortly after 538 BCE to restore the land tenure situation to what it had been forty-nine years before would have invalidated the land claims of a majority — perhaps a large majority — of the returning exiles, who had been deported *fifty-nine* years previously.

(2) The only large-scale simultaneous return of exiles for which we have information is the one under Zerubbabel, which is generally held to have occurred a decade or more after 538 BCE <sup>(44)</sup>, by which time the forty-nine-year period would no longer be appropriate.

(3) There is no support in the text of Lev 25 to justify interpreting Cyrus' edict as marking a year of jubilee <sup>(45)</sup>. One has difficulty imagining how the exiles could advance such an argument, based on this text, in a title dispute against the actual inhabitants of the land of Israel.

(4) Taking the edict of Cyrus as the end of the jubilee cycle ironically implies the cycle *began* in 587 BCE, the year the (second wave of) exiles *left* the land, not the year they *entered* the land, which runs directly counter to Lev 25,1.

In addition to being implausible, the supposed explanation of the

---

are the product of exilic or post-exilic redactors, and both books almost undoubtedly reflect the perspective of the exiles and their descendants (cf. Jer 24,5-6.8.10; 2 Kgs 24,14; 25,12), not those who remained in the land. So, according to the exiles' own beliefs, the majority of them were taken in 597 BCE (cf. R.P. CARROLL, "Empty Land", who argues that almost all the relevant biblical literature reflects the perspective of the exiles of 597 BCE and their descendants, who naturally saw this deportation as the most important.) If the exiles had invented a jubilee terminating with Cyrus' decree, it should have been on a fifty-nine year cycle.

<sup>(44)</sup> Many scholars hold the view that there was an initial return under Sheshbazzar (Ezra 1,9), and a larger one under Zerubbabel sometime later, c. 525 BCE. However, there is no record of Sheshbazzar's expedition, and John Bright concludes, "It is unlikely that any major return of exiles took place at this time" (*A History of Israel*, [Louisville '2000], 362-363). Miller and Hayes argue that conditions were not conducive for a large-scale return until the reign of Cambyses (530-522 BCE) (cf. MILLER – HAYES, *History*, 446-447).

<sup>(45)</sup> The chronicler (i.e. 2 Chr 36,20-23) makes a connection between the period of the exile and the sabbatical years of Lev 25,1-7, and thus may subtly hint at an association between the Cyrus edict and the jubilee year. However, this would be a reinterpretation of the text of Leviticus; there are no traces of an identification of the jubilee with Cyrus' decree in the text of Lev 25 itself. Interestingly, even in Lev 26, which is closely linked with Lev 25 thematically and linguistically, there is no explicit promise of a return from the exile.

jubilee cycle by the duration of the second deportation is unnecessary, since there already exists an explanation for the jubilee cycle that is internal to the Holiness Code. The Feast of Weeks (Lev 23,15-16) is based on the same  $49 + 1$  numerology as the jubilee, and is a much more proximate and likely inspiration for the pattern<sup>(46)</sup>. However, in their eagerness to attribute the forty-nine years of the jubilee to the duration of the second deportation, advocates of the land-reclamation hypothesis have more or less completely overlooked the similarity between the Feast of Weeks (Lev 23,15-16) and the jubilee (Lev 25,8-10)<sup>(47)</sup>, despite the fact that the correlation was already recognized by Wellhausen<sup>(48)</sup> and — long before him — by the rabbis (*Sifra Emor* 12,8).

The  $49 + 1$  pattern of both the Feast of Weeks and the jubilee has its origin in the “seven-mysticism” that is pervasive in the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible<sup>(49)</sup>. Forty-nine is seven times seven, and therefore a quintessentially numinous number. In fact, the text of the jubilee itself stresses the significance of forty-nine as the square of seven:

<sup>(46)</sup> See e.g. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2163, 2166.

<sup>(47)</sup> For example, a perusal of the indices of both FAGER (*Land Tenure*, 132) and CARDELLINI (“*Sklaven*”-Gesetze, 436) reveals that neither makes reference to Lev 23,15-16 anywhere within their monographs. Similarly, Bianchi shows no awareness of the correspondence of Lev 23,15-16 and Lev 25,8-10, but finds the coincidence of the lengths of the second deportation and the jubilee to be decisive evidence in support of a post-exilic setting for Lev 25 (“Jobeljahr”, 84).

<sup>(48)</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Atlanta 1994) 118-120, esp. 119; repr. of *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allen Enzies, with preface by W. Robertson Smith) (Edinburgh 1885); trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin <sup>2</sup>1883). Says Wellhausen, “In the Priestly Code the year of jubilee is further added to supplement in turn the sabbatical year (Lev. xxv 8 seq.). As the latter is framed to correspond with the seventh day, so the former corresponds with the fiftieth, i.e. with Pentecost, as is easily perceived from the parallelism of Lev. xxv. 8 with Lev. xxiii. 15. As the fiftieth day after the seven Sabbath days is celebrated as a closing festival of the forty-nine days’ period, so is the fiftieth year after the seven sabbatic [*sic*] years as rounding off the larger interval; the seven Sabbaths falling on harvest time, which are usually reckoned specially (Luke vi. 1), have, in the circumstance of their interrupting harvest work, a particular resemblance to the sabbatic years which interrupt agriculture altogether. The jubilee is ... superimposed upon the years of fallow regarded as harvest Sabbaths after the analogy of Pentecost” (118-119).

<sup>(49)</sup> On the significance of the number seven throughout the ancient Near East, see J. FREIBERG, “Numbers and Counting”, *ABD* IV, 1139-1146. On the use of seven in H, cf. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 17–22, 1323-1325; GERSTENBERGER, *Leviticus*, 377; and SNAITH, *Leviticus*, 162, who mentions Assyrian examples of the sacrality of the number 49.

וספרת לך שבע שבחת שנים שבע שנים שבע פעמים והיו לך ימי שבע שבחת השנים  
חשע וארבעים שנה

You shall count off seven weeks of years — seven times seven years  
— so that the period of seven weeks of years gives you a total of forty-  
nine years (Lev 25,8).

The counting system of the Feast of Weeks (Lev 23,15-16) provides an explanation for the forty-nine years of the jubilee that is internal to the Holiness Code and arises naturally from the “seven-mysticism” characteristic of the same. It is unclear why an external and speculative explanation — such as the forty-nine years of the second deportation — is either necessary or compelling. Perhaps this line of reasoning would be more convincing if the number of years of both the jubilee and the second deportation were irregular or unprecedented in biblical literature, e.g. thirty-seven or sixty-one.

## 2. *Omissions in the Text of Provisions for the Exilic Situation*

There are at least three elements “missing” from the jubilee legislation which one would expect to be present had it been written or redacted with a “land-reclamation” agenda. The “omission” of these elements would have made the jubilee impossible to implement in the post-exilic situation, at least for the purpose of returning land to the exiles.

(1) From when does one count the jubilee cycle? Lev 25 does not provide a way of determining when the jubilee should be observed. The text simply says, “Count off seven Sabbaths of years” (v. 8). From when? The only suggestion in the text is found in v. 1: “When you enter the land”. Thus, the narrative projection of the text is that the Israelites should observe the jubilee every forty-nine (or fifty) years, starting from the year in which they entered the land, presumably under Joshua (i.e. the settlement).

How was this to apply to the post-exilic situation? Perhaps “when you enter the land” was meant to refer to the year the exiles returned. However, if the jubilee was meant to justify the immediate repossession of the exiles’ lands, why does the legislation not take effect until fifty years after they have returned to their homeland (v. 8)<sup>(50)</sup>? Would the exiles really want to wait in Israel fifty years before repossessing their lands?

(2) What if one misses a jubilee? The logistics of organizing a

<sup>(50)</sup> Cf. MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2242.



major, permanent migration from Babylon back to Israel probably precludes the possibility that any large group of exiles returned within a year of Cyrus' edict (538 BCE)<sup>(51)</sup>. If 538 BCE was considered a jubilee year by the redactors of Lev 25 — as most “land-reclamation” proponents seem to hold — most of the exiles would have missed it. This raises another major omission of the text: what happens if one misses a jubilee? The text does not deal with the possibility that an heir to ancestral property might not be present to regain title to his land in the year of jubilee. Does the land then become the permanent possession of the current owner? Must the heir wait for the following jubilee to repossess it? Does it immediately revert to the heir in whatever year following the jubilee that he actually does show up to claim it? The text does not specify. However, the text does imply that jubilees have been counted since Israel's initial entry into Canaan. If this were actually the case, probably all the returning exiles would have missed a jubilee<sup>(52)</sup>. Any of the second wave (587 BCE) of deportees and their descendants who returned after 538-537 BCE would have missed the “jubilee” inaugurated by the edict of Cyrus. The larger first wave (597 BCE) of deportees and descendants would have missed two “jubilees”: the one in 587-586 BCE and that in 538-537 BCE. Any non-exiled Israelite whose land “the priests” wished to repossess could easily point out that the exiles had missed the last jubilee and therefore forfeited their land.

The missing of a jubilee is precisely the sort of issue one would expect to be dealt with by a redactor. A short gloss could quickly clarify the situation for the exiles benefit: “And if your brother Israelite should be in exile during the year of jubilee, and unable to reclaim his possession, he shall receive it back on the day that he does return to the land.”

(3) How does the exile effect the land rights of deportees? The third and most critical omission of Lev 25 — when read as a “land-reclamation” text — is that it does not deal with the theological meaning of the exile *vis-à-vis* the possession of the land: was the exile a divine judgment against the land-claims of the exiles?

Certainly many non-exiled Israelites interpreted it as such. This is sufficiently clear from (the priest) Jeremiah's vision of good and bad figs:

<sup>(51)</sup> MILLER – HAYES, *History*, 446-447.

<sup>(52)</sup> Except those taken in the second deportation who actually managed to return within a year of the edict.

As with these good figs, so will I single out for good the Judean exiles whom I have driven out from this place to the land of the Chaldeans. I will look upon them favorably, and bring them back to this land ... And like the bad figs, which are so bad that they cannot be eaten, so will I treat ... the remnant of Jerusalem that is left in this land ... I will send the sword, famine, and pestilence against them until they are exterminated from the land that I gave to them and their fathers (Jer 24,5-6.8.10, NJPS).

It seems clear that Jeremiah is arguing against the inhabitants of Jerusalem who felt the exile was a judgment against those exiled, and divine vindication of themselves. Who will ultimately possess the land is one issue at stake. While the “remnant” left in the land felt as though they had been favored by God, and were justified in their appropriation of the property left by the exiles, Jeremiah insists the exiles — not those left behind — are favored by God and would ultimately inherit the land.

The contours of this debate are confirmed by Jeremiah’s younger contemporary, (the priest) Ezekiel. Ezek 11,15 records an oracle of the LORD to Ezekiel:

O mortal, [I will save] your brothers, your brothers, the men of your kindred, all of that very House of Israel to whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem say, “Keep far from the LORD; the land has been given as a heritage to us” (NJPS).

Again, we see that the inhabitants of Judah between the first and second deportations (597 BCE and 587 BCE) regarded the exiles as providentially dispossessed, and themselves as divinely authorized to occupy the land. Those left behind by the second deportation felt similarly:

O mortal, those who live in these ruins in the land of Israel argue, “Abraham was but one man, yet he was granted possession of the land. We are many; surely, the land has been given as a possession to us” (Ezek 33,23-24, NJPS).

In the following verses, Ezekiel polemicizes against the non-exiled Israelites. In agreement with Jeremiah, Ezekiel declares that God’s favor, including the right to inherit the land, lies not upon the remnant but upon the exiles.

Both the priests Ezekiel and Jeremiah, therefore, testify that there existed a debate between survivors and exiles about who had the “mandate of heaven” to possess the land. Yet the “priestly” text of Lev 25 does not address the issue. One would expect a gloss in the text such as, “If your brother Israelite is exiled to the land of your enemies,

but the LORD remembers him and brings him back to this land, you shall return to him his holding”.

A provision very similar to this, although concerning the return of a wife and not real estate, can be found in the Laws of Eshnunna:

If a man has been made prisoner during a raid or an invasion or if he has been carried off forcibly and [stayed in] a foreign [count]ry for a [long] time (and if) another man has taken his wife and she has born him a son — when he returns, he shall [get] his wife back<sup>(53)</sup>.

Here is explicit evidence that ancient Near Eastern legislators could and did take into account the possibility of a return from exile and its ramifications for property (a wife) seized in one’s absence. What would have prevented the supposed exilic priestly redactors of Lev 25 from inserting a clause like the above with “land” substituted for “wife”? Compare also the Code of Hammurabi §27:

In the case of either a private soldier of a commissary who was carried off while in the armed service of the king, if after his (disappearance) they gave his field and orchard to another and he has looked after his feudal obligations — if he has returned and reached his city, they shall restore his field and orchard to him and he shall himself look after his feudal obligations<sup>(54)</sup>.

All that was necessary for the “priests” to justify the restoration of their pre-exilic lands was to insert a line similar to LE §29 or CH §27 into their code of law and attribute it to Moses. One such line would render the entire jubilee legislation irrelevant as a means of reacquiring their lands.

Those who propose a “land-reclamation” final redaction of Lev 25 must offer an explanation for the failure of the text to address the issue of the exile in general, and particularly its effect on an Israelite’s right to his land<sup>(55)</sup>. Could it be that the priestly exilic redactors did not

<sup>(53)</sup> Laws of Eshnunna §29, *ANET* 162b; virtually identical to Code of Hammurabi §135, *ANET* 171b. Cf. also Middle Assyrian Laws §36 and §45, which state that a returned exile gets his lands back, but if he has died, the crown shall reassign them.

<sup>(54)</sup> *ANET* 167a.

<sup>(55)</sup> Fager recognizes the polemic between exiles and those left behind: “During the decade following the first deportation, it was often believed that those exiles were the ones being punished for Judah’s sins. This became more difficult to believe after the destruction of Jerusalem, yet those who remained in Palestine still made the claim that the exiles had been expelled from the cultic community (Ezek 11,14-17). Not only did this add to the exiles’ sense of alienation from the ritual that made them part of the Yahwistic community, it also seems that

realize that exile would be interpreted as a divine judgment against the land claims of the exiles? This is hardly possible, as Ezekiel realized it was an issue, and Ezekiel is closely associated with the “Holiness School” to whom the redaction of Lev 25 is generally attributed. Could it be that the fiction of Mosaic authorship prevented the redactors from attributing something as anachronistic as provisions for the exile to the text? This is unlikely, since the exile is mentioned extensively in Lev 26<sup>(56)</sup>. Could it be that the redactors were so disconnected with reality that they thought the connection between returning sold land and returning the land of exiles was obvious to all? Such an interpretation runs counter to the “land-reclamation” hypothesis, however, which tends to regard the “priests” as realistic, even cynical practitioners of *Realpolitik*<sup>(57)</sup> who forged Lev 25 as a legal fiction to justify their very real re-appropriation of land.

Thus, there seems to be no satisfactory explanation for this omission. The sole means of alienation of land mentioned in Lev 25 is sale. It does not provide instruction for rectifying alienation through other processes such as exile<sup>(58)</sup>.

---

‘participation in the cult was somehow connected with the legal right to the land’” (*Land Tenure*, 48). Despite recognizing this problem, Fager does not account for the failure of the jubilee laws to address the problem of exile *vis-à-vis* title to one’s land. Like most “land-reclamation” interpreters, Fager assumes it would have been clear to everyone that the jubilee provisions applied to loss of land through exile, even though the only type of land alienation mentioned in the text is that of sale.

<sup>(56)</sup> Interestingly, Lev 26, in its discussion of the exile, never explicitly says that the LORD will bring those exiled back to the land.

<sup>(57)</sup> Cf. RINGE, *Jesus*, 28: “The redactors of the Holiness Code, like the priests and other official leaders, appear to have approached the problems of Israel’s resettlement by concentrating on the *concrete ordinances and judgments* that would prepare the way for God’s dwelling in the midst of the people” (emphasis mine). Cf. also FAGER: “the priests were a part of the ruling class in Jerusalem, involved in financial matters of temple, and they were part of the intelligentsia of a nation in exile in a very advanced empire. It is difficult to believe that they could not have foreseen the economic stumbling blocks of the jubilee” (*Land Tenure*, 110). It is difficult to see how the jubilee can simultaneously be a piece of hard-headed, cynical *Realpolitik* (a “ploy” [GOTTWALD, “Jubilee”, 37]) and also utopian and impractical. See above, note 15.

<sup>(58)</sup> Cf. Gottwald’s point (as quoted in MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23–27, 2243) that the jubilee legislation provided no way to settle jurisdictional disputes in the restoration.

### 3. *Other Difficulties Not Addressed by Lev 25*

In addition to the failure to deal with the significance of the exile *vis-à-vis* land claims, there are other issues not addressed in the text that would have confronted returning exiles, such as the destruction of property records and the disturbance of boundary stones. Indeed, since we have textual evidence that many families' genealogical records had been lost or destroyed (Ezra 2,62), it is a small leap to suppose that property records were in a similar state. Moreover, since most of those who were adults at the time of deportation would have died in exile, the vast majority of those who returned would have been at best children when deported. More commonly, they would have been born and raised in exile, never having seen their ancestral land, and therefore not knowing its location or boundaries. Again, Lev 25 would have been no help in this regard. The right to return to one's property does little good if one does not know where one's property is or what its boundaries are<sup>(59)</sup>.

## IV. A Comparison with Ezekiel

To get a proper perspective on the true nature of the legislation of Lev 25, it is useful to compare it with a vision of land reform for which we have firmer evidence to believe was written in the exile, by a priest or priestly circle closely associated with the Holiness School, with the intent of providing regulations for the restoration: Ezek 45–48<sup>(60)</sup>.

Ezekiel<sup>(61)</sup> realized that the confusion over land title caused by

<sup>(59)</sup> One could argue that "the priests" did not foresee these difficulties, but cf. FAGER, *Land Tenure*, 110, quoted above, note 57.

<sup>(60)</sup> Ezekiel 40–48 has been — and continues to be (e.g. BIANCHI, "Jobeljahr", 88) — attributed to late post-exilic redactors. However, since it was the Torah of Moses and not the Torah of Ezekiel that was considered authoritative in the restoration period (cf. H. NAJMAN, *Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* [Leiden, forthcoming]), it is difficult to imagine what if any motivation could have existed to retroject unrealistic laws into Ezekiel's mouth in, e.g., the fifth century BCE. For the attribution of Ezek 40–48 to the prophet himself, see M. GREENBERG, "The Design and Themes of Ezekiel's Program of Restoration [Ezek 40–48]", *Int* 38 (1984) 181–208. W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 2* (trans. J.D. MARTIN; ed. P.D. HANSON – L.J. GREENSPOON) (Philadelphia 1983) 547–55, thinks these chapters reached substantially their final form at the hands of Ezekiel's disciples at about the time of the initial return from exile. On the authorship and exilic dating of Ezekiel, see above, note 1.

<sup>(61)</sup> We follow Greenberg in attributing Ezek 40–48 to the prophet. However, even if the material was augmented by his disciples into the period of the initial return, as held by Zimmerli (see previous note), the arguments presented here

multiple deportations, opportunistic appropriations, and the influx of foreign settlers in the exile rendered completely unworkable a simplistic return to pre-exilic land possessions. Moreover, the priest Ezekiel, so closely associated with the Holiness School<sup>(62)</sup>, did not approve of the way the land was distributed before the exile (45,7-9; 46,16-18), his biggest complaint being the expropriation of private lands by the royal house<sup>(63)</sup>.

What was needed was a fresh start, an entirely new re-allocation of the land. This is what Ezekiel provides, giving extensive instructions for the redistribution of the land (Ezek 45,1-8; 47,13-48,29) according to the tribes of Israel, giving the borders (47,15-20), *explicit* authorization to reallocate the land (47,21-22), provision for the foreigners that had been settled in it by Assyria and Babylon (47,22-23); and including space for the Levites (45,5; 48,13-14), the priests (45,3-4; 48,9-12), the sanctuary (45,2; 48,8), the holy city (45,1; 48,15-20) and the royal house (45,7-8; 48,21-22).

Interestingly, so far from desiring the return of lands to the priests themselves, the priest Ezekiel forbids the possession of lands to the priests (Ezek 44,28-31). He knows of the jubilee, mentioning it in

---

would still be valid. One would only need to replace the name "Ezekiel" with "the Ezekielian school" in the text below. What is pertinent to the argument is only that Ezek 40-48 represents the perspective of a priest or priestly circle in the exile, not that it comes from the prophet so named.

<sup>(62)</sup> On Ezekiel's relationship with the Holiness School, see above, note 1.

<sup>(63)</sup> Ezekiel's testimony on this point is particularly interesting, because an unspoken and unsubstantiated assumption of the "land-reclamation" hypothesis is that "the priests" were in favor of the land distribution situation prior to the exile and wanted to return to it. However, it seems quite plain from the scriptural texts from the late pre-exilic and exilic period that land was *not* distributed with equity (cf. Isa 5,8; Mic 2,2; Ezek 34,17-22; 46,18; cf. Gottwald as quoted in MILGROM, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2243). Why would the priests want to restore this situation of inequity? Perhaps the very cynical position could be advanced that, despite appearances, the purpose of the jubilee legislation was *not* to restore equity but to restore the *inequity* of land distribution before the exile, which benefited the priests and the other returning exiles. However, Ezekiel witnesses to a different attitude among the priests. Moreover, interpretations that posit such economically self-serving interests as the motivation for the jubilee legislation's final form cannot be maintained when the text is studied at length. Fager, who favors a modified "land-reclamation" hypothesis, still concludes, "The Jubilee rested upon the assumption that all Israelites were attached to family land allotted to the several families at the time of the conquest of Canaan; therefore there was the basic presupposition that God willed all Israelites to have a relatively equal opportunity to share in the richness of the land" (*Land Tenure*, 110).

passing (Ezek 46,16-18)<sup>(64)</sup>, but for him it is a provision for periodic restoration of ancestral land, not a blueprint for post-exilic reallocation.

The problems attending any use of Lev 25 as a blue-print for land restoration in the post-exilic period do not pertain to Ezekiel's vision. He does not single out "inhabitants" as the subject of his legislation, nor is urban property excluded from distribution. The problems of when to hold a jubilee, what do if one is missed, and the implications of the exile *vis-à-vis* land claims do not apply: the people are authorized to divide up the land completely anew, respecting the ancient tradition of distribution by tribe (and presumably smaller family units), but not bound to a now-irrecoverable state of affairs obtaining in previous generations.

Ezekiel's vision of land redistribution looks like — and claims to be — a blueprint for the restoration of Israel's land, written by a priest (or priestly school) in the Holiness tradition in the exile. While the restoration did not take the exact form Ezekiel envisioned<sup>(65)</sup>, and

<sup>(64)</sup> On Ezekiel's knowledge of the jubilee, cf. the comments on Ezek 46,17 by G.A. COOKE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1936), 512-513: "*the year of release* is referred to here as an established institution needing no comment ..."; likewise H. WILDBERGER, "Israel und sein Land", *EvTh* 16 (1956) 415: "Jedenfalls beweisen die Ezechielstellen, daß das Jahr der Freilassen im alten Israel eine bekannte Ordnung gewesen ist"; and W. ZIMMERLI, "Das 'Gnadenjahr des Herrn'", *Archäologie und Altes Testament*. Festschrift für Kurt Galling zum 8. Jan. 1970 (ed. A. KUSCHKE – E. KUTSCH) (Tübingen 1970) 328: "[I]n diesem wohl in der Exilszeit entstanden Gesetze [wird] diese Institution ganz selbstverständlich vorausgesetzt. Nichts deutet daraufhin, daß sie hier erst durchgekämpft werden mußte." It should be noted that in the opinion of ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel* 2, 346-247; GREENBERG, "Design and Themes", 190; and J.D. LEVENSON, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40-48* (HSM 10; Missoula, MT 1976) 18, the "twenty-fifth year of our exile" (Ezek 40,1) in which the temple vision occurred indicates the half-way point of a jubilee cycle beginning in 597 BCE, at the end of which (547 BCE) the prophet anticipated the restoration of Israel. If this is the case, then the forty-nine/fifty-year period of the jubilee was already established in the exile, thus invalidating the land-reclamation hypothesis. The date formula of Ezek 40,1 cannot be a post-exilic retrojection placing Ezekiel's vision at the half-way point of a "jubilee" cycle construed as 587-538 BCE, because Ezekiel dates the "twenty-fifth year" from the first deportation.

<sup>(65)</sup> Ezekiel seems to have expected larger numbers of returning exiles, including representatives of the Northern tribes dispersed more than a hundred years earlier. In fact, only relatively small numbers of Israelites took up Cyrus' offer to return, and these were mostly Judeans. Nor was the entire land of Israel restored, but only a reduced Judah.

some of his provisions are impractical in hindsight<sup>(66)</sup>, at least he deals with the issues that exiles would have anticipated facing. Lev 25, on the other hand, does not look like a plan for the reallocation of land after the exile, and does not look like it has been redacted for this purpose. It does not resolve the issues that the returning exiles could have anticipated facing.

\*  
\* \* \*

This paper has examined the hypothesis that the final redaction of Lev 25 was performed by “the priests” in the post-exilic period with the intent to provide legal justification for the repossession of their lands and those of the other exiles. This hypothesis has been found inadequate to explain the final form of Lev 25. Not only do certain features of the text — such as its mention of “inhabitants” and the ban on the return of urban property — conflict with the interests of the returning exiles, but major issues that the exiles would have faced in regaining their lands are not addressed at all, such as when to hold a jubilee, what to do if one is missed, and whether the jubilee provisions cover alienation of land due to exile. Comparison of Lev 25 with the land reform legislation of Ezekiel highlights the differences between Lev 25 and actual priestly laws aimed at the restoration of land after the exile.

100 University Village #E2  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, Indiana

John Sietze BERGSMA

### SUMMARY

The article examines the hypothesis that the jubilee legislation of Lev 25 was a post-exilic attempt on the part of returning Judean exiles — particularly the priests — to provide legal justification for the reclamation of their former lands. This hypothesis is found to be dubious because (1) the jubilee did not serve the interests of the socio-economic classes that were exiled, and (2) Lev 25 does not show signs of having been redacted with the post-exilic situation in mind. A comparison with Ezekiel’s vision of restoration points out the differences between Lev 25 and actual priestly land legislation for the post-exilic period.

<sup>(66)</sup> Ezekiel had a mental picture of Israel with Jerusalem in its geographic center. His redistribution is based on such a view. Cf. LEVENSON, *Theology*, 115-118.



# ANIMADVERSIONES

## Récit et noms de Dieu dans le livre de Jonas

On retrouve dans le livre de Jonas de nombreuses nominations différentes pour désigner le divin: «YHWH», «mon / ton / son dieu», «le Dieu», «YHWH Dieu», «Dieu». Ce petit récit prophétique peut-il être ainsi considéré comme le livre du problème du nom de Dieu et de ses attributs<sup>(1)</sup>? Cette question n'est pas neuve comme le démontre le *status quaestionis* récemment élaboré par M. Mulzer. De façon intéressante, ce dernier propose une triple distinction: il commente tout d'abord les hypothèses diachroniques de la critique littéraire (de W. Böhme à L. Schmidt), puis les hypothèses synchroniques attribuant le choix des différentes nominations de Dieu aux associations sémantiques (de T. Boman à J. Magonet) et enfin les explications structurales (de N. Lohfink à H.J. Opgen-Rhein)<sup>(2)</sup>. S'il est inutile de reprendre ici ce travail impressionnant, on rappellera cependant les études les plus suggestives<sup>(3)</sup>.

Le premier à avoir abordé cette problématique est probablement W. Böhme, à la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle<sup>(4)</sup>. À sa suite, l'alternance des noms divins dans le livre de Jonas a été interprétée par l'exégèse historique comme le résultat de différentes couches rédactionnelles, l'une yahwiste, l'autre élohiste<sup>(5)</sup>. Elle trahirait donc une rédaction par étapes, même s'il est impossible d'isoler un récit primitif des couches secondaires<sup>(6)</sup>. D'autres exégètes ont estimé qu'il fallait simplement considérer les termes comme étant interchangeables et ainsi privilégier la liberté littéraire de (des) l'auteur(s)<sup>(7)</sup>.

(<sup>1</sup>) La question posée ici est une affirmation dans P.R. SCALABRINI – G. FACCHINETTI, "Ninive, la grande città. Giona", *Parola Spirito e Vita* 26 (1992) 76.

(<sup>2</sup>) M. MULZER, "Die Gottesbezeichnungen im Jonabuch", *Wer darf hinaufsteigen zum Berg JHWHs?* Beiträge zu Prophetie und Poesie des Alten Testaments. FS S.Ö. Steingrímsson (ed. H. IRSIGLER) (ATSAT 72; Sankt Ottilien 2002) 52-58.

(<sup>3</sup>) Parmi les nombreuses études basées sur le texte canonique, relevons p.ex. J. DAY, "Problems in the Interpretation of the Book of Jonah", *In Quest of the Past* (ed. A.S. VAN DER WOUDE) (OTS 26; Leiden 1990) 43-44; R.B. SALTERS, *Jonah and Lamentation* (Old Testament Guides; Sheffield 1994) 37-38; R.E. LONGACRE – S.J.J. HWANG, "A Textlinguistic Approach to the Biblical Hebrew Narrative of Jonah", *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. R.D. BERGEN) (Dallas 1994) 353-355; A. KAMP, *Innerlijke Werelden. Een cognitief taalkundige benadering van het Bijbelboek Jona* (Tilburg 2002) 125-126.

(<sup>4</sup>) W. BÖHME, "Die Composition des Buches Jona", *ZAW* 7 (1887) 270-275.

(<sup>5</sup>) Cf. les *status quaestionis* élaborés par M. DELCOR, "Jonas", *Les petits prophètes* (ed. A. DEISSLER – M. DELCOR) (La Sainte Bible 8/1; Paris 1961) 267; F.D. KIDNER, "The Distribution of Divine Names in Jonah", *Tyndale Bulletin* 21 (1970) 127.

(<sup>6</sup>) Comme le soulignent S. AMSLER e.a., *Les Prophètes et les livres prophétiques* (Petite Bibliothèque des Sciences Bibliques - Ancien Testament 4; Paris 1985) 325.

(<sup>7</sup>) KIDNER, "The Distribution of Divine Names", 128; DAY, "Problems in the Interpretation", 44.

Une première lecture du livre de Jonas permet d'observer une quintuple distinction parmi les noms divins: «YHWH», présent dans les quatre chapitres mais absent en 3,5-10; «mon / ton / son Dieu», avec un déterminant possessif à la 1<sup>re</sup>, 2<sup>e</sup> ou 3<sup>e</sup> p.s., absent du deuxième acte, soit les chapitres 3 et 4<sup>(8)</sup>; «le Dieu», expression absente du deuxième chapitre; «Dieu», sans article ni suffixe, absent du premier acte; «YHWH-Dieu», absent du troisième chapitre<sup>(9)</sup>. Aucun chapitre, ni acte d'ailleurs, ne contient à lui seul les cinq dénominations<sup>(10)</sup>. Au plan narratif, aucune d'elles n'est réservée à un unique acteur dans le récit; seul le narrateur utilise les cinq formes. J. Magonet se contente quant à lui d'une triple distinction qu'il justifie ainsi: *Dieu* est adoré par les marins (Jon 1) et les Ninivites (Jon 3); *le Dieu* est *Dieu Un et Universel* reconnu par le chef d'équipage (1,6) et le roi de Ninive (3,9-10), identifié — seulement par les marins — comme étant *YHWH* (1,10-16), le Dieu d'Israël. Un autre système prendrait forme en Jon 2 et 4 dans le cadre de discussions intra-israélites, entre Jonas et Dieu. Ici, Magonet ne distingue plus *Dieu* et *le Dieu*. Finalement, Magonet rejoint l'interprétation rabbinique qui affirme que *YHWH* est le terme générique des attributs de la miséricorde, tandis que *Dieu* est réservé à la stricte justice<sup>(11)</sup>.

Plus succinctement, A. et P.-E. LaCocque tentent une autre approche. Dans sa relation avec Jonas, Dieu est toujours *YHWH*, sauf en 4,7-9. Par rapport aux marins, il est *Dieu*, mais il devient *YHWH* après avoir été identifié devant eux par Jonas (1,9). Pour Ninive, il est *Dieu*. LaCocque explique l'exception de 4,7-9 en fonction du contexte de la nature: «Il ne devient *YHWH* que quand le plan naturel est remplacé par le plan historique, là où la bonté de Dieu est à nouveau soulignée (4,10)»<sup>(12)</sup>. Malgré ces constatations, il faut reconnaître que la recherche biblique sur ce sujet complexe semble contraster par rapport à la modicité des résultats.

«La nomination de Dieu est [...] d'abord une nomination narrative» écrit P. Ricœur<sup>(13)</sup>. Dans cette ligne, peut-être la problématique des noms de Dieu

<sup>(8)</sup> Le livre de Jonas est considéré par la majorité des commentateurs comme étant formé de deux actes: Jon 1-2 et 3-4.

<sup>(9)</sup> Cf. le tableau descriptif de Sasson, qui émet toutes ses réserves par rapport à une interprétation rapide de cette question complexe: J.M. SASSON, *Jonah* (AB 24B; New York 1990) 18.

<sup>(10)</sup> En cela, il est déjà difficile d'affirmer avec Christensen que Jon 4 est le seul texte biblique (hébreu), en dehors du Pentateuque, pour lequel les différents noms divins apparaissent dans une telle proximité. Pourquoi réserver cette remarque à cet unique chapitre? Cf. D.L. CHRISTENSEN, "Jonah and the Sabbath Rest in the Pentateuch", *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel*. FS N. Lohfink (ed. G. BRAULIK e.a.) (Fribourg – Bâle – Vienne 1993) 56.

<sup>(11)</sup> J. MAGONET, *Form and Meaning*. Studies in Literary Techniques in the Book of Jonah (Bible and Literature Series; Sheffield 1983) 33-38; J. MAGONET, "The Names of God in Biblical Narratives", *Words Remembered. Texts Renewed*. FS F.A. Sawyer (ed. J. DAVIES e.a.) (JSOTSS 195; Sheffield 1995) 90-91.

<sup>(12)</sup> A. et P.-E. LACOCQUE, *Le complexe de Jonas*. Une étude psycho-religieuse du prophète (Initiations; Paris 1989) 41; cf. aussi KIDNER, "The Distribution of Divine Names", 126; V. MORA, *Jonas* (Ev 36; Paris 1981) 36-41.

<sup>(13)</sup> P. RICOEUR, "Nommer Dieu", *ETR* 52 (1977) 497, cité par A. GESCHÉ, "Pour une identité narrative de Jésus", *RTL* 30 (1999) 165. En ce sens, nous pouvons lire: "le nom de Dieu n'est pas 'détachable' du mouvement de la nomination, et ce mouvement fait se recouper entre eux les trois plans: la narration proprement dite, bien sûr, et les interlocutions qui, au fil du récit, inscrivent le nom dans des paroles entre les humains et Dieu, entre Dieu

pourrait-elle mieux s'éclairer en prenant en compte l'évolution narrative, au long de l'ensemble du récit. Mulzer partage cette intuition lorsqu'il écrit: «Die Gottesbezeichnungen im Jonabuch richten sich zunächst nach dem jeweiligen Erzählkontext [...]»<sup>(14)</sup>. Une reprise, à peine esquissée par Mulzer, s'avère donc nécessaire. Afin de clarifier l'exposé, voici d'abord un tableau des différentes dénominations de Dieu, en fonction des épisodes et des personnages qui les utilisent<sup>(15)</sup>:

Jon 1 narrateur - marins - <b>Jonas</b>	Jon 2 narrateur - <b>Jonas</b>	Jon 3 narrateur - Ninivites	Jon 4 narrateur - <b>Jonas</b>
↓	↓	↓	↓
v. 1-4: <i>YHWH</i>	v. 1: <i>YHWH</i>	v. 1-3a: <i>YHWH</i>	v. 2a: <i>YHWH</i>
v. 5: <i>son Dieu</i>	v. 2: <i>YHWH son Dieu</i>	v. 3b-5: <i>Dieu</i>	v. 2a: <i>YHWH</i>
v. 6a: <i>ton Dieu</i>	v. 3: <i>YHWH</i>	v. 8: <i>Dieu</i>	v. 2b: <i>Di(eu)</i>
v. 6b: <i>le Dieu</i>	v. 7b: <i>YHWH mon Dieu</i>	v. 9: <i>le Dieu</i>	v. 3: <i>YHWH</i>
v. 9: <i>YHWH (le) Dieu</i>	v. 8-10: <i>YHWH</i>	v. 10: <i>le Dieu</i>	v. 4: <i>YHWH</i>
v. 10: <i>YHWH</i>	v. 11: <i>YHWH</i>		v. 6: <i>YHWH Dieu</i>
v. 14a: <i>YHWH</i>			v. 7: <i>le Dieu</i>
v. 14b: <i>YHWH</i>			v. 8-9: <i>Dieu</i>
v. 16: <i>YHWH</i>			v. 10: <i>YHWH</i>

En Jon 1, *YHWH* est le Dieu de l'Hébreu tandis que *Dieu* est mis en connexion avec les non-Israélites. Le passage est progressif, de *YHWH* (v. 1-4) à *Dieu* (avec le déterminant possessif, ensuite avec l'article défini; v. 5-6), puis à nouveau *YHWH* (reconnaissance des marins; v. 9-16). La profession de foi de Jonas qui réunit les deux noms («*YHWH le Dieu [du ciel]*»; v. 9) éclaire cette transition.

En Jon 2, le narrateur et Jonas utilisent exclusivement cette même terminologie: *YHWH* et *Dieu* (avec le déterminant possessif). En effet, Jonas reprend la dénomination utilisée par le narrateur («*YHWH son Dieu*»; v. 2) au moment où *YHWH* redevient le Dieu de Jonas («*YHWH mon Dieu*»; v. 7) en lui rendant la vie. Ce rappel évoque celui du chef d'équipage («*ton dieu*»; 1,6) reprenant la terminologie utilisée par le narrateur pour les marins («*son dieu*»; 1,5). Ce type de reprise et, dès lors, la relation à Dieu décrite avec le déterminant possessif disparaît au deuxième acte.

En Jon 3, *YHWH* est le Dieu de l'Hébreu et *Dieu* est mis en connexion avec les non-Israélites, comme c'était le cas dans le chapitre premier. *YHWH* est uniquement présent avec Jonas, au début de ce troisième chapitre (v. 1-3a). Et de même que le chapitre premier avait révélé une progression claire dans la conception qu'avaient les hommes du divin, de même, dans la suite du

et les humains»; cf. B. VAN MEENEN, *Dieu: le nom d'un seul?* Autour de la nomination biblique de Dieu (Séminaire pluridisciplinaire de théologies aux Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis; Bruxelles 2002), 4.

<sup>(14)</sup> MULZER, «Gottesbezeichnungen im Jonabuch», 52.

<sup>(15)</sup> Cf. aussi le tableau proposé par G. VANONI, *Das Buch Jona. Literar- und formkritische Untersuchung* (ATSAT 7; Sankt Ottilien 1978), 167, repris par MULZER, «Gottesbezeichnungen im Jonabuch», 45-47.

troisième chapitre, une évolution du même genre est perceptible. Dans un premier temps, Ninive, puis les hommes de Ninive sont mis en relation avec *Dieu* (sans article défini; v. 3b-8). À partir de la reprise personnelle du roi, il sera question de *le Dieu* (avec article défini; v. 9-10). Le narrateur suit également cette dénomination. Ainsi, les Ninivites rejoignent le type de relation atteint par les marins, même si ceux-ci ont pu encore progresser dans leur relation à *le Dieu* en le nommant *YHWH*, grâce à la profession de foi de Jonas. Cette progression finale, les Ninivites n'ont pas pu la mettre en œuvre, le nom de *YHWH* ne leur ayant été révélé ni dans une profession de foi (comme en 1,9) ni dans le message de Jonas (3,4b)<sup>(16)</sup>!

En Jon 4, la variation des dénominations est plus complexe, d'autant qu'elle se situe dans une relation unique de *YHWH* / (le) Dieu à Jonas. Si la relation personnelle mise en évidence dans le premier acte a disparu («mon / ton / son Dieu»), Jonas poursuit la relation avec *YHWH* (v. 2a) là où elle en était restée en 3,3. Mais Jonas ajoute à cette dernière dénomination celle qui fait partie de la formule traditionnelle citée: *Dieu* ('*el*, v. 2b). Pourtant la relation avec *YHWH* se maintient (v. 3-4). Comme la double dénomination divine *YHWH-Dieu* a marqué le basculement des premier et deuxième chapitres, celle de 4,6 fait de même dans le quatrième. *Le Dieu*, dénomination qui caractérise une relation nouvelle au divin mais non aboutie en *YHWH*, prend le relais (v. 7), avant que ne revienne à son tour le simple *Dieu*, qui, dans le deuxième acte, caractérise la première perception qu'avaient les Ninivites (v. 8-9). Ainsi, le parcours du quatrième chapitre mène Jonas, au fil d'une communication qui s'étiole, d'une relation à *YHWH* à une relation à *Dieu*. Enfin, une ouverture fragile s'annonce: c'est *YHWH* (v. 10) qui a le dernier mot, comme pour signifier que cette reconnaissance telle que l'ont vécue les hommes (1,14-16) et, précédemment, Jonas lui-même (2,3-10) est toujours possible.

En résumé, les hommes (Jon 1) découvrent progressivement *YHWH* reconnu d'une manière plénière, grâce à la profession de foi de Jonas («*YHWH* le Dieu»). Par la prière (Jon 2), celui-ci maintient sa relation à *YHWH*, et ce dialogue s'approfondit par la redécouverte de celui qui donne la vie, *YHWH* [...] *Dieu*. Les Ninivites (Jon 3) découvrent progressivement *le Dieu*, sans reconnaissance plénière de *YHWH*, vu l'absence du double nom divin dans ce chapitre. Enfin, après avoir prolongé sa relation avec *YHWH* (Jon 4), Jonas rompt le dialogue; alors progressivement, *YHWH Dieu* se dépersonnalise en *le Dieu*, puis en *Dieu*. Ainsi, le double nom divin est le terme qui souligne narrativement le basculement de la relation: positif (Jon 1-2) ou négatif (Jon 4).

L'acte même de la nomination de Dieu s'inscrit donc dans la trame du récit et dans l'interaction des personnages. Autrement dit, elle n'est ni coupée du contexte ni rendue par *un seul*<sup>(17)</sup> personnage: à l'exception de Dieu lui-même, tous les personnages du récit (le narrateur, Jonas, les marins et les Ninivites) nomment le divin. Jonas chemine le long du récit au fil de ces nominations qui disent en quoi sa relation aux autres est ajustée ou non. Le

<sup>(16)</sup> Pour rappel, la dénomination «*YHWH-Dieu*» est présente dans chacun des chapitres, hormis le troisième.

<sup>(17)</sup> Comme le souligne VAN MEENEN, *Dieu: le nom d'un seul*, 7.

livre se terminant par une question ouverte, la scène finale détourne l'attention du monde interne du texte et la focalise sur le monde externe du lecteur. Jonas ne répondant pas à la question finale de YHWH (4,11), n'est-ce pas au lecteur à faire basculer une ultime fois la relation à Dieu dans un sens positif?

Université catholique de Louvain  
Grand-Place, 45  
B – 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve

Claude LICHTERT

#### SUMMARY

The problem of the different names of God in the book of Jonah is regularly discussed by researchers. There have been attempts to resolve this question through diachronic hypotheses (as part of literary criticism), as well as by synchronic hypotheses which attribute the choice of different names for God to semantic associations or to the structure of the story as a whole. This study offers an interpretation which considers the changes in the name for God as a function of the narrative. Thus, the very act of naming God comes from the story itself and through the interaction of its characters. The analysis offered here, after a brief study of each chapter of the book, shows that the double divine name ("YHWH God") is the term that brings out the positive or negative twists and turns in the narrative. In brief, Jonah makes his way through the story with different names for God, each indicating how God's relation with others is positive or not.

## Dating the Apocalypse to John (\*)

Previously I have accepted the consensus opinion that the Apocalypse to John was written during the reign of the Emperor Domitian<sup>(1)</sup>. Recently, however, in dialogue with colleagues, I have had cause to reconsider my earlier position. The present study will reexamine the major arguments for a Domitianic dating and one in the late 60's soon after the death of Nero, along with some evaluative comments.

The consensus opinion takes its cue from Irenaeus that the Apocalypse was written "near the end of the reign of Domitian"<sup>(2)</sup>. Many modern commentators have generally accepted Irenaeus' witness<sup>(3)</sup>. The major arguments are worth repeating. Some have argued that this date is correct because imperial claims to divine honors occurred more frequently during this period and created a great deal of pressure upon non-adherents to conform. In conjunction with this dating, traditionally some exegetes have argued, following Irenaeus, that Domitian initiated an empire-wide persecution of Christians.

Additionally, exegetes have argued that "Babylon" became a code name for Rome near the end of the first Christian century, as found in 1 Pet 5,13; 4 Es 3,1; Sib 5,143.159 and ApcBar(gr) 10,1-3; 11,1 and 67,7, all dated between 60 and 120 CE. Many commentators note that several of these passages refer to Rome/ Babylon as the second destroyer of Jerusalem and the second temple in 70 CE<sup>(4)</sup>.

"In Jewish literature, the enemy Rome is designated Edom, Kittim, and Egypt, as well as Babylon. For the most part, however, the identity with Babylon occurs after 70 CE, that is, Rome is called Babylon after she destroys Jerusalem and the Temple"<sup>(5)</sup>.

Still others have argued that the Nero myth in Rev 13,1-4, 18 and 17,9-11, which symbolically represent the first Roman emperors, would indicate that the Domitianic date is most probably correct, that Domitian is the second Nero, the eighth ruler. Rev 17,9-11 reads as follows:

\*For Harold W. Attridge who first presented the idea to me.

(1) T.B. SLATER, *Christ and Community* (JSNTSS 178; Sheffield 1999) 22-26.

(2) Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 5.30.3.

(3) For example, M. KIDDLE, *The Revelation of St. John* (London 1940) xxxvi-xliii; L. MORRIS, *Revelation* (TNTC; Leicester 1987) 35-41; J.P.M. SWEET, *Revelation* (Philadelphia 1979) 21-26; R.H. MOUNCE, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) 15-21.

(4) On dates for these books, see *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. CHARLESWORTH) (Garden City, NY 1983) I, 390, 520, 615-617; D. BALCH, *Let Wives Be Submissive* (SBLDS 26; Chico, CA 1981) 137-38; J.H. ELLIOTT, *A Home for the Homeless* (Philadelphia 1981) 78-84. See also G.A. KRODEL, *Revelation* (Minneapolis 1989) 63; M.E. BORING, *Revelation* (Interpretation; Louisville 1989) 10-12.

(5) L.L. THOMPSON, *The Book of Revelation. Apocalypse and Empire* (Oxford 1990) 14.

"Here is the mind which has wisdom: The seven heads are seven mountains upon which the woman sits. They are also seven kings. Five have fallen, one is, another has yet to appear and whenever he appears it is necessary for him to remain a brief time. And the beast who was and is not, he is the eighth and is from the seven and he goes to perdition".

Proponents of the Domitianic date, whether they begin counting with Julius Caesar or with Augustus Caesar, or Caligula, the emperor who first openly demanded divine honors, find a way to end with Domitian, omitting Galba, Otho and Vitellius, who each ruled briefly from 68-69 between Nero and Vespasian, along the way<sup>(6)</sup>.

\*  
\* \*

First and foremost, it must be stated that the Domitianic date is based upon Irenaeus, an external witness at least a century later than the writing of the Apocalypse. Irenaeus has not proven to be a credible historical witness. For example, Irenaeus stated that he knew Polycarp and that Polycarp knew John the Apostle, implying that he has received accurate tradition from an apostle through Polycarp. While this is possible, many church historians have doubted the veracity of this statement since Polycarp would have been quite young when John died and Irenaeus would have been very young when Polycarp died. In any event, it is highly doubtful that Polycarp could have received any extensive training of any type from John or that he would have been able to pass it on to a very young Irenaeus. Irenaeus also argued that the Apocalypse to John and the Gospel of John were written by one and the same John the Apostle. A brief examination of the genres (apocalypse versus gospel), the writing style (capable versus solecistic Greek) and theology (eschatological apocalypticism versus realized eschatology) indicate that it is highly unlikely that both were written or authorized by the same person. Additionally, Wilson is critical of Irenaeus for not identifying his source for claiming that the Apostle John wrote both books<sup>(7)</sup>. Indeed, the Apocalypse never appeals to apostolic authority or to a disciple of an apostle (cf. John 21, 24), a powerful social tool in the early church as evidenced in Paul's letters (e.g., Gal 1,11-2,21; 1 Cor 9,1-18; 2 Cor 10,1-11,15). If indeed the tradition that Irenaeus gives us concerning the authorship of the fourth gospel and the Apocalypse are apostolic, its accuracy leaves much to be desired.

As noted earlier, Irenaeus is an external witness writing approximately a century after Domitian's reign. He is far removed from the actual events and at best must rely upon second-hand witnesses himself. Thompson and others have demonstrated clearly that there was no empire-wide persecution of Christians inaugurated by Domitian<sup>(8)</sup>. Moreover, Thompson has shown conclusively that

<sup>(6)</sup> See R.H. CHARLES, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (ICC; Edinburgh 1920) II, 68-70; J.H. ULRICHSEN, "Die sieben Haupter und die zehn Hörner. Zur Datierung der Offenbarung des Johannes", *ST* 39 (1985) 1-20; KRODEL, *Revelation*, 297.

<sup>(7)</sup> J.C. WILSON, "The Problem of the Domitianic Date of Revelation", *NTS* 39 (1993) 597-598.

<sup>(8)</sup> See, for example, THOMPSON, *Revelation*, 95-115.

the writings of the Roman historians who were Irenaeus' primary sources had themselves intentionally given a poor depiction of Domitian in order to ingratiate themselves to Trajan and his new imperial family. Thus, for these reasons, Irenaeus is not the most reliable source for dating the Apocalypse to John and can only be used as a supporting witness, if then.

While some have argued that there was great pressure upon Christians to conform to regional religio-political pressures during Domitian's reign<sup>(9)</sup>, in actuality those pressures were present from the early days of the Empire in the Roman province of Asia. Price provides solid evidence of heavy competition among the cities of the province to be designated *neokoros*, an official site of the imperial cult<sup>(10)</sup>. More importantly, members of the imperial family received divine honors during Augustus' reign. Dio Cassius writes that during Augustus' reign Roman citizens in Asia were required to worship the divine Julius Caesar; the provincials, Augustus. Pausanias writes that there was a temple to Octavia, Augustus' sister, in the first century BCE. By 14 BCE, Aphrodisias had a temple dedicated to Augustus. Later, Claudius' living grandmother was given divine honors<sup>(11)</sup>. Thus, while there is no proof whatever of an empire-wide persecution of Christians under Domitian, by the time he becomes emperor the region has seen divine honors given to members of the imperial family for over a century. By this time, a substantial tradition and a large degree of expectation for adherence would have developed in the region. One purpose for the bestowing of divine honors was to establish a meaningful personal link with the imperial family that would result in positive political and economic benefits for the local community. Therefore, pressure to conform to religio-political traditions could have occurred in the region at any time in the latter decades of the first century BCE and the first century CE, not only during the rule of Domitian, when local residents felt that Christians (or anyone else for that matter) were not observant of those traditions. Similarly, Rowland argues those who resisted conformity to regional traditions and pressures might have produced protest literature at any time during this same era. Thus, a Domitianic date is not the only option for dating the Apocalypse<sup>(12)</sup>.

"Babylon" is indeed used as a code name for Rome in the latter decades of the first century CE and the early decades of the second century CE in 1 Peter, *Sibylline Oracle* 5, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. As such it is an important internal witness in dating the Apocalypse. However, it should be noted that Daniel, written in the second century BCE, and *Sibylline Oracle* 3.300-309, usually dated in the first century BCE, also employ "Babylon" as a code name for an evil empire which opposes the people of God. In Daniel, Babylon is a code name for the Syrian empire and the Syrians did not destroy the temple. Babylon here is merely the name for the enemy of God and God's elect.

<sup>(9)</sup> For example, BORING, *Revelation*, 8-25.

<sup>(10)</sup> S. PRICE, *Rituals and Power*. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor (Cambridge 1984) 24-25, 249-274.

<sup>(11)</sup> See Dio Cassius, *Roman Histories* 51.20.6-7; SEG 23.206; IGRR 4.1608c; J. M. REYNOLDS, "The Origins and Beginnings of the Imperial Cult at Aphrodisias", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 206 (1980) 70-84; N. KOKKINOS, *Antonia Augusta*. Portrait of a Great Lady (London 1992) 158-162.

<sup>(12)</sup> C. ROWLAND, *The Open Heaven*. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity (New York 1982) 412.



*Sibylline Oracle 3*, which Collins dates between 163-45 BCE, mentions the destruction of the temple by the Babylonians<sup>(13)</sup>. In this case, the Babylonians are probably the Syrians as *Sibylline Oracle 3* is probably written in Ptolemaic Egypt. It is worth noting that the reference to the destruction of the temple is not elaborated upon but used as a standard reference to an enemy. Again, the Syrians did not destroy the Jerusalem temple. Therefore, for *Sibylline Oracle 3* the connection between the Babylonians and the Syrians is based upon the perception that both are evil empires and not the destruction of the temple *per se*. Indeed, Thompson correctly notes that Kittim, Edom, and Egypt are symbols for the enemies of God and there is no reason to believe that Babylon could not function in this more general way as in Daniel.

Again, it is noteworthy that the Apocalypse does not refer to Babylon/Rome as the destroyer of the temple. Indeed, the temple is still standing in the Apocalypse to John (11,1-2)<sup>(14)</sup>. Rather than commenting upon the destruction of the second temple, the Apocalypse could be using the code name Babylon to represent the political presence of Satan in the world and its eventual downfall. This is precisely what one finds in Rev 12,1-13,18 and 17,1-9,4: Babylon is the enemy of God that must be punished in the end-times. Using Babylon in this way is consistent with the use of such names to symbolically refer to an enemy of the elect community, in some instances using Kittim, in others, Egypt. Furthermore, it is consistent with the use of Babylon in both Daniel and *Sibylline Oracle 3* to refer to an evil empire as mentioned earlier. It is just as conceivable that Revelation is reading Daniel and re-applying the meaning of Babylon for a pre-70 date prior to the destruction of the temple. Indeed, Farrer showed long ago that John re-applied traditional images and it is clear that he often re-interpreted them to fit his situation<sup>(15)</sup>. Jewish apocalypses regularly adapted and transformed traditional materials for their own times. The Apocalypse to John clearly follows suit. For example, Davidic messianic expectations (Rev 5,4-12; cf. 4 Es 11,36-46), the one like a son of man (cf. Dan 7,13 and Rev 1,7-16) and the Leviathan-Behemoth myth (Rev 13,1-18; cf. 4 Es 6,49) are all recast in John's Apocalypse.

The symbolic references to the emperors found in Revelation 13 and 17 are also important internal witnesses. However, too many exegetes have omitted Galba, Otho and Vitellius from their listing of first century CE Roman emperors without proving that John would have also omitted them. Rather, they worked backward from Domitian in order to make their presupposed dating fit the data instead of the reverse. After Nero's death in 68 CE, Galba, Otho and Vitellius all ruled briefly as emperor until Vespasian eventually took control in 69 CE. Bell, Rowland and Wilson have all shown that ancient writings, including *Sibylline Oracle 5* and writers such as Suetonius, Tacitus and Eutropius, included these three men in their respective lists of emperors. If John included Galba, Otho and Vitellius, and there is no

<sup>(13)</sup> Cf. J.J. COLLINS, "The Sibylline Oracles", *OTP*, I, 354-357.

<sup>(14)</sup> R.J. Bauckham's interpretation of Rev 8,1 supports my point that the temple is still standing when John writes. Bauckham convincingly argues that the 30-minute silence in heaven parallels the burning of incense each morning in the temple after the lamb had been sacrificed. This lasted approximately 30 minutes (*The Climax of Prophecy* [Edinburgh 1993] 70-83); see also WILSON, "Domitianic Date", 599-605.

<sup>(15)</sup> A.M. FARRER, *A Rebirth of Images* (Boston 1949).

reason to think that John's list would differ significantly from others, Revelation 13 and 17 would indicate, based upon the rules of exegeting *ex eventu* prophecy, that the book was written between 68-70 CE. *Ex eventu* prophecy is prophecy-after-the-fact that is often found in apocalyptic literature. It is often very helpful in dating books. Such "prophecies" are true to a certain point and then usually the point at which they are inaccurate is the date when the book was written. That would make either Otho or Vitellius the eighth emperor in the Apocalypse<sup>(16)</sup>. More will be said on this topic later.

Thus, for all the aforementioned reasons, a Domitianic dating is rather problematic. Are there examples of internal evidence, along with those already mentioned, which might help to date the book? Bell, Rowland and Wilson, in my opinion, have offered the best arguments for an earlier dating of John's Apocalypse between 68 and 70 CE. We turn now to discussions of their work.

\*  
\* \*

Bell's work is often referred to but rarely taken seriously. This is unfortunate. Bell correctly avoids attempting to discern whether or not one should begin counting the Roman emperors with either Julius Caesar or Augustus Caesar. Instead, he begins with the fifth emperor who is clearly Nero (see Rev 13,3 and 17,9-11). As stated previously, ancient writers included Galba, Otho, and Vitellius in their lists. He notes such inclusions in Suetonius, Plutarch, and Eutropius. Additionally, he correctly argues that for 4 Es 12,16 (dated ca. 100 CE) to speak of 12 emperors it had to have included Galba, Otho, and Vitellius in the 12. He demonstrated that according to Roman custom anyone duly inducted into an office would have been included in any official list of office-holders. He dates the Apocalypse between June 68 and January 69 during Galba's reign<sup>(17)</sup>. "Armies in Spain, Germany and Judaea are supporting rival candidates for the principate. Where there had been order and peace, for as long as any man living could recall, there is suddenly anarchy and civil war"<sup>(18)</sup>. Finally, he notes that while Suetonius mentions Nero's persecution, he does not mention one initiated by Domitian<sup>(19)</sup>.

Concurring with Bell, Rowland also includes Galba, Otho and Vitellius when reading Revelation 13 and 17. He agrees with Bell that Nero is clearly the fifth emperor and that the book was written during the reign of Galba. "No other explanation of these verses matches the simplicity of this interpretation, which, one may assume, would also have been the most obvious to the original readers of the document"<sup>(20)</sup>. He adds, again concurring with Bell, that the political turmoil which ensued after Nero's death throughout the Roman Empire during 68 CE, coupled with the apocalyptic imagery found in the book, clearly points to 68 CE as the time of the writing of the Apocalypse to John.

<sup>(16)</sup> A.A. BELL, JR., "The Date of John's Apocalypse: The Evidence of Some Roman Historians Reconsidered", *NTS* 25 (1978-79) 99-100; ROWLAND, *Open Heaven*, 403-407; WILSON, "Domitianic Date", 599-605.

<sup>(17)</sup> BELL, "The Date", 97-102.

<sup>(18)</sup> BELL, "The Date", 102.

<sup>(19)</sup> BELL, "The Date", 96.

<sup>(20)</sup> ROWLAND, *Open Heaven*, 405.

Wilson also emphasizes internal evidence. The most important internal evidence is 17,9-11. He also includes Galba, Otho and Vitellius in reckoning the list of emperors. He concurs with Bell and Rowland that it is most important that Nero is clearly the fifth emperor. Wilson identifies 666 as a gematria for NERON KAISAR. "When the name is put into Hebrew and the numerical equivalents of the Hebrew letters are added together, the sum is 666." Moreover, "The 616 (variant) would take the final *nun* off the name Neron in order to render it Nero, the acceptable way of saying the name in Greek"<sup>(21)</sup>. Since Nero is the fifth emperor, Galba is the sixth, the one who is and Otho is yet to come. For Wilson, as with Bell and Rowland, the Apocalypse was written during the reign of Galba.

Furthermore, Wilson argues that the Apocalypse has no *ex eventu* prophecies and that the book is clearly not a pseudepigraphon (see Rev 22,10). This is important to him in dating the book. Thus, for Wilson, the Apocalypse should be dated at the point when it speaks of present events. That would be the reign of Galba. The lack of *ex eventu* prophecy also relates to Wilson's next point: the temple in Jerusalem is still standing when the book was written (see Rev 11,1-2). He notes that the prophecies concerning the Temple were not fulfilled by history: (1) the entire Temple was taken over, not merely the outer court; (2) the Romans took only a few days to destroy Jerusalem, not 42 months. The fact that the temple is still standing, as I noted earlier, is a key element in dating the book. Frequently, scholars date books in this period by whether or not the books refer in any way to the destruction of the temple.

\*  
\* \*

While I agree that the book is not a pseudepigraphon, I would add two minor correctives to Wilson. First, I would argue that the Apocalypse to John is not an apocryphon as well as not being a pseudepigraphon. Many ancient works could be pseudepigraphal but not apocryphal. A pseudepigraphon is a work written falsely and intentionally in the name of an ancient worthy in order to make it more credible to its readers. The *Psalms of Solomon* is an example of a pseudepigraphical writing that is not apocryphal. An apocryphon is a book that is supposedly hidden until the time when its final prophecies would come true. The Apocalypse is not an apocryphon because John believed that the prophecies would come true soon: "And he said to me, 'Do not seal the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is near'" (22,10; cf. 1,1-3). And this brings me to my second corrective: while the Apocalypse is not an apocryphon, it is clearly a book of prophecy for John. In both instances when John says that the events will occur soon, he refers to his book as one of prophecy. John sincerely believes that his work provides a vision of coming events. For this reason, there is no extended *ex eventu* prophecy, but there is some and it is found in Rev 17,9-11. The reference to Nero as the fifth emperor is *ex eventu* prophecy in that it speaks of Nero's death after the fact and

<sup>(21)</sup> WILSON, "Domitianic Date", 598. This is an important contribution by Wilson for at once he explains the variant and what the original reading would have been. Furthermore, he clearly demonstrates how more than one group would have understood the gematria to refer to Nero, even those who wanted to change the spelling.

predicts that he will return, an appropriation of the *Nero redivivus* myth. It is a stretch to argue that the *Nero redivivus* myth preceded Nero's death. Thus, the Apocalypse does indeed contain *ex eventu* prophecy. It is quite possible that John wrote during the reign of Galba, but it is also possible that he wrote during the reign of Otho who "must only rule briefly" (17,10). To this point, John's prophecies are historically accurate. They are inaccurate with the next ruler, Vitellius, who in no way reminded people of Nero. According to the rules of *ex eventu* prophecies, the book should be dated at the point where the prophecies are not fulfilled. It is possible that John was writing in 69 late in Otho's reign or early in Vitellius' reign.

I am, therefore, in general agreement with a date between 68-70 CE and would add one more additional bit of internal evidence. There are two examples, found in Rev 2,9 and 3,9, which have been overlooked. In both passages, "Jew" is an honorific term, the religious ideal. This means that John sees himself first and foremost as a faithful Jew and that he sees the Christian community as the true Israel. His opponents are not criticized because they are Jews but because they are not faithful, righteous Jews. Such a self-identification by a Christian is more understandable in the 60's than in the 90's when Christians and Jews were beginning to see themselves more as separate groups. I am aware that the separation of Christianity from Judaism was a gradual, regional event that occurred at different times and different places throughout the Roman Empire; however, it is more likely that one in the Christian movement would see himself as a Jew during Nero's reign than during Domitian's.

An earlier date would also help to explain why the book is so Jewish and also why some exegetes have postulated that chapters 1, 2, 21 and 22 constitute a Jewish apocalypse; chapters 3-20, a Christian one<sup>(22)</sup> It is both Christian and Jewish at a point in time when this fact would have been a given for the original readers. Such a self-designation and self-understanding is much more intelligible in the 60's, when Christianity was still very much within the Jewish religious community, than the 90's, when Christianity saw itself more and more as separate and distinct from Judaism.

Department of Religion  
The University of Georgia  
Athens, Georgia 30602-1625  
USA

Thomas B. SLATER

## SUMMARY

The present study re-examines the major arguments for dating the Apocalypse to John. It argues that internal evidence should be preferred over external witnesses and that the internal evidence suggests, based upon the *ex eventu* prophecy in Rev 17,9-11, that the book was written in 69, either late in Otho's reign or early in Vitellius' reign.

<sup>(22)</sup> For example, S.A. EDWARDS, "Christological Perspective in the Book of Revelation", *Christological Perspectives*. Essays in Honor of Harvey A. McArthur (eds. R.F. BERKEY - S.A. EDWARDS) (New York 1982).

## And Lead Us Not into Temptation

The evangelist Matthew depicts Jesus during the Sermon on the Mount instructing his followers how to pray and to address God as “Our Father”<sup>(1)</sup>. The sixth petition of the Pater Noster (PN) in his Gospel (6,13) reads: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμῶς εἰς πειρασμόν, “and lead us not into temptation”. The same wording is found in the fifth and last petition of the PN in Luke 11,4. It has been transmitted in this form in all the Greek manuscripts of both Gospels; there are no variant readings. The same wording is found also in *Didache* 8,2 and is echoed in Polycarp, *Phil.* 7,2.

Different from all the preceding petitions in the PN, it is formulated in the negative, but is followed by a complementary petition introduced by an adversative conjunction, “But deliver us from evil (*or* the Evil One)<sup>(2)</sup>. Pace G. Schwarz, there is no reason to exclude the sixth petition from the original PN as formulated by Jesus<sup>(3)</sup>. Only two words in the sixth petition call for some explanatory comment.

The first is the verb μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς, the aorist subjunctive of εἰσφέρω, used as a polite form of a negative imperative. The verb εἰσφέρω means “bring into” (an area or place), as in Luke 5,18-19, where men, who were carrying a paralyzed man on a pallet, sought to bring him in (αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν) before Jesus, but found no way to do so (εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν) because of the crowd. Similarly in LXX of Gen 43,18; Exod 23,19; Num 31,54. In 1 Tim 6,7 it is said that “we brought nothing (οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκομεν) into the world”, a saying that is quoted in Polycarp, *Phil* 4,1. See further Heb 13,11; Luke 12,11 (bring into court).

The verb is also used in a wider sense of causing someone to enter an event or a condition, as if it were a place; this is the sense of the sixth petition, as in Matt 6,13; etc. A related, but slightly different nuance is found in Acts 17,20, where Paul is said “to be bringing in subjects foreign” to the ears of Athenians (ξενίζοντά τινα εἰσφέροντες). Similarly, Hermas, *Sim.* 8.6.5 (διδάξας ξένους εἰσφέροντες); Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.1.2. In all these instances, the meaning of the compound verb (εἰς + φέρω) is clear, “bring, carry in”, “lead in”. In view of modern discussions of the meaning of the verb, it is important to note that εἰσφέρω translates in the vast majority of its

(<sup>1</sup>) Extensive bibliography can be found in M. DORNEICH, *Vater-Unser Bibliographie*. Jubiläumsgabe der Stiftung *Oratio Dominica* (Freiburg im B. 1982); J. CARMIGNAC, *Recherches sur le “Notre Père”* (Paris 1969) 469-553. See also W.M. BUCHAN, “Research on the Lord’s Prayer”, *ExpTim* 100 (1988-89) 336-339; P. FIEBIG, *Das Vaterunser*. Ursprung, Sinn und Bedeutung des christlichen Hauptgebets (Gütersloh 1927); J. HENSLE, *Das Vaterunser*. Text- und literarkritische Untersuchungen (NTA 4/5; Münster in W. 1914); E. LOHMEYER, *The Lord’s Prayer* (London 1965).

(<sup>2</sup>) The two parts of v. 13 were at first considered to be all one petition, but Augustine started the trend to separate them, when he counted the petitions in the Matthean form of the PN as seven (*Enchiridion* 30.115; CCLat 46.111).

(<sup>3</sup>) See G. SCHWARZ, “Matthäus VI. 9-13 Lukas XI.2-4: Emendation und Rückübersetzung”, *NTS* 15 (1968-69) 233-247. He does not consider 6,13a to be part of the original PN.

occurrences in the LXX causative forms of the Hebrew verb בּוּא, especially the hiphil בּוּא (e.g. Deut 7,26); it occurs once as the translation of the Aramaic aphel of עלל in Theodotion's version of Dan 6,19 (לֹא הִנְעַל, rendered as οὐκ εἰσήνεγκαν).

The second word that needs some comment is πειρασμόν. The noun is anarthrous, basically meaning "test", "trial". It and the cognate verb πειράζω denote the action by which one verifies or probes the quality of a person or thing, as in Wis 3,5; Gen 22,1; Sir 6,7; 27,5,7; 1 Pet 4,12. In such cases, it means "a test" or "a probe". It can, however, often denote an attempt to get someone to do something wrong, a "temptation", or "enticement" (to sin). In what sense is πειρασμός used in the sixth petition of the PN? It has been understood in three different ways.

(1) For many commentators the emphasis in the Matthean PN is eschatological (\*). In this case πειρασμός would refer to the tribulation of the end-time (see Mark 13,19, alluding to Dan 12,1; Rev 3,10) and would denote the eschatological "trial" enticing the faithful to apostasy. Whether the same nuance would be present in the Lucan PN, which betrays more concern for the everyday existence of Christians (\*), is debatable. A number of commentators, however, contest this eschatological meaning of anarthrous πειρασμός, because it is nowhere else so used in the NT (\*).

(2) πειρασμός in the sixth petition could denote rather a "testing" of the faithful even in one's ordinary existence (apart from the eschatological tribulation); French *épreuve* (\*).

(3) πειρασμός could mean in the sixth petition "temptation"; this is a wider sense of the constant danger of enticement to sin, as elsewhere in the NT (e.g. Mark 14,28; Matt 26,41; 1 Thess 3,5; 1 Tim 6,9; Jas 1,12).

For many commentators, πειρασμός in this petition, whether it is understood in the eschatological sense or in the wider sense, scarcely denotes something that come from within the human being (doubts, craving, illness, covetousness), but is seen rather as something that comes from without. It would rather be a force, situation, or event that confronts the person being tested or tempted, coming perhaps from someone or something that challenges the individual to show fidelity. It can be either human or diabolic, as the seventh petition of the Matthean PN may suggest, depending on whether τοῦ πονηροῦ is taken as neuter, "evil", or masculine, "the Evil One",

(\*) So R.E. BROWN, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer", *TS* 22 (1961) 175-208; rep. *New Testament Essays* (Milwaukee, WI 1965) 217-253; J. DUPONT - P. BONNARD, "Le Notre-Père: Notes exégétiques", *Maison Dieu* 85 (1966) 7-35, esp. 27-30; J. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus* (SBT 2/6; London - Naperville, IL 1967) 105; C. B. HOUK, "Πειρασμός, the Lord's Prayer, and the Massah Tradition", *SJT* 19 (1966) 216-225.

But cf. J.B. GIBSON, "Matthew 6:9-13 // Luke 11:2-4: An Eschatological Prayer?", *BTB* 31 (2001) 96-105; S. VAN TILBORG, "A Form-Criticism of the Lord's Prayer", *NovT* 14 (1972) 94-105. Cf. S. E. PORTER, "Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4: 'Lead Us not into Temptation'", *ExpTim* 101 (1989-90) 359-362; he maintains that πειρασμός is anarthrous and never clearly used in the NT of final tribulation (unless carefully qualified); hence it refers to temptations that could occur at any time in this age.

(\*) See J.A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke* (AB 28; Garden City, NY 1981, 1985) I, 899-900.

(\*) E.g., U. LUZ, *Matthew 1-7. A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN 1989) 384.

(\*) See J.V. DHAMS, "'Lead Us Not into Temptation'", *JETS* 17 (1974) 223-230.

i.e. Satan. In the Matthean Gospel *πειρασμός* or the verb *πειράζω* otherwise denotes a testing coming from a hostile human or diabolic source (4,1.3; 16,1; 19,3; 22,18.35), intended to undermine someone's status (often Jesus').

My further remarks on the sixth petition will be made under nine headings: 1. The literal translation of the petition; 2. The testing or tempting in the petition; 3. The mode of expressing God's activity; 4. The early permissive paraphrase as a reformulation of the petition; 5. A Jewish parallel to the petition; 6. Modern reformulations in Romance-Language countries; 7. Attempts to justify the permissive paraphrase; 8. The Greek formulation of the petition; and 9. The pastoral problem of explanation.

### 1. *The Literal Translation of the Petition*

Because of the meaning of *εἰσφέρω* and *πειρασμός* just mentioned, the sixth petition of the PN has often been rendered in other languages in diverse ways, which should be noted. The most commonly used form follows that of the *Vetus Latina* and the *Vulgate*:

*Vulgate*: ne inducas nos in temptationem (ed. R. Weber).

*Syriac Peshitta*: *wēlā' ta'lan lēnesyūnā'* (ne inducas nos in temptationem); the Old Syriac version of Matthew reads rather *wēlā' 'aytēyan* (do not make us come).

*English*: lead us not into temptation (RSV, NIV, NRSV footnote)<sup>(8)</sup>.

*German*: führe uns nicht in Versuchung (Einheitsübersetzung, Luther, Klostermann, Gnllka, Wilckens, Wiefel).

*French*: ne nous conduis pas dans la tentation (TOB [1988], Bonnard).

*Italian*: non ci indurre in tentazione.

*Czech*: a neuvod' nás v pokušení.

*Flemish/Dutch*: en leid ons niet in bekoring.

*Polish*: nie wódź nas na pokuszenie.

This form is sometimes slightly modified, while retaining the same basic sense:

bring us not into temptation (R. H. Gundry); bring uns nicht hinein in Versuchung (A. Sand); ne nous induisez pas à la tentation (Crampon, van den Bussche); ne nous soumetts pas à la tentation (SBJ); do not subject us to temptation (Goodspeed, Grant).

Sometimes this form is used with reference to the eschatological trial:

do not lead us into trial (R.E. Brown); do not subject us to the final test (NAB); do not bring us to the time of trial (NRSV); ne nous soumetts pas à l'épreuve (Evêques de France).

<sup>(8)</sup> Almost all the forms of the PN in Old English have followed the *Vulgate* version; see A.S. COOK, "The Evolution of the Lord's Prayer in English", *AJP* 12 (1891) 59-66. Wyclif version (ca. 1380): "and lede us not in to temptacioun". — The permissive form is found in the ninth-century *Heliand* 1610-11, "Do not let evil little creatures lead us off to do their will, as we deserve, but help us against all evil deeds" (G.R. MURPHY, *The Heliand. The Saxon Gospel* [Oxford – New York 1992] 55-56). (My thanks to Murphy for this information; he tells me it comes from the *Diatessaron*.)

## 2. *The Testing or Tempting in the Petition*

No matter how one formulates this basic sense of the sixth petition of the PN, it shows that Jesus taught his followers to ask God not to lead them into temptation, a trial, or to the final test of their fidelity.

The NT even records that Jesus himself was so tested by God. After his baptism by John the Baptist, Mark records that “immediately the Spirit drove him (αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει) out into the desert”, where he stayed for forty days, “being tempted by Satan” (1,12-13). The causality of the Spirit is unmistakable. Matthew similarly records, “Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil” (ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, 4,1). In this case, the causality of the Spirit is even more expressed. See also Luke 4,1-2, who notes that Jesus was “filled with the Spirit”, an allusion to the baptismal scene of 3,21-22. The Spirit leads Jesus to a confrontation with Satan, in which he would prove himself faithful as Son of God. Clearly, the Spirit is not the source or the origin of the testing or temptation but acts as the divine agent in bringing Jesus into a situation where his filial fidelity is tested.

If Jesus during his earthly life was subjected by God’s Spirit to such a testing or temptation, it has provided the background for the sixth petition in the prayer that he taught his followers to address to his and their heavenly Father.

Both Jesus’ example and the sixth petition are simply echoing a notion already found in the OT of God subjecting his people Israel to tests, trials, or temptations. Thus Abraham was “tested” by God in requesting him to sacrifice his only son, Isaac (Gen 22, 1-2), after he had promised him a numerous offspring (Gen 15,5-6; 17,19; cf. Sir 44,20d; 1 Macc 2,52; Heb 11,17). Again God “tested” the Israelites in the desert, when they sighed for the fleshpots of Egypt, to see “whether they would follow my instructions or not” (Exod 16,4). See further Exod 20,20; Deut 8,2-3.16; 13,3; Prov 3,12; and especially Job 1,8-12.22; 40,8; 42,2.7, where God even initiates the testing of Job. In Tob 12,14 Raphael admits that he “was sent to test” Tobit, i.e., sent by God (Tob 3,17).

This testing often involved an action on the part of God that was not always good for the people involved, at least not immediately good; indeed, sometimes it was evil. Thus when God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the lords of Shechem (Judg 9,22-24); or when God sent an evil spirit against Saul (1 Sam 18,10). Similarly, when God’s anger was enkindled against Israel, he incited David against them, urging him to take a census of the Israelites (2 Sam 24,1), an evil deed that the Chronicler later ascribes rather to Satan (1 Chr 21,1). Dan 1,1-2 records how Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem, “and the Lord gave Jehoiakim, king of Judah, into his hand” (יהון ארני בידו את־יהויקים, LXX: καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτὴν [Jerusalem] κύριος εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ); cf. 2 Kgs 24,11. Again, “Who delivered Jacob to the spoiler, and Israel to robbers? Was it not the Lord, against whom we have sinned?” (Isa 42,24-25). Many other examples of such attribution to God of evil effects caused for human beings could be cited; in many cases the purpose or end result may be good, but the immediate action is not so. Hence the counsel in



Ben Sira, "My child, if you come to serve the Lord, prepare yourself for temptation" (2,1). This mode of thinking, however, is based on the conviction that God leads his people at all times and is with them even when he leads them into such tests, temptations, or evil.

An interesting instance of the same way of speaking of God is found in a pre-Christian Palestinian Jewish text found in Qumran Cave 11. In a prayer preserved in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> 24,10 (= Ps 155 [Syriac Psalm III], line 11)<sup>(9)</sup>, one reads, "and lead me not into what is too hard for me"<sup>(10)</sup>.

### 3. *The Mode of Expressing God's Activity*

Both in these OT and Jewish instances and in the temptations of Jesus himself, one detects a protological way of thinking and of expressing God's activity. It ascribes to God or his Spirit a causality the effect of which could be to the detriment of the persons concerned. God is thought to be somehow the cause of it, even if the temptation or testing does not come from God himself. This mode of thinking is called protological, because it attempts to explain the resulting condition of failure or apostasy, but it is not a wholly logical explanation.

It begins with the idea of God leading his people, bringing them where they have to go. As it develops, it even attributes to God all the good and evil that comes to human beings, because he is the cause and creator of everything. Thus Deutero-Isaiah manifests this mode of thinking when it depicts God saying, "I fashion light and create darkness. I make well-being and create evil. I, the Lord, do all these things" (Isa 45,6c-7)<sup>(11)</sup>. StuhlmueLLer aptly remarks apropos of this verse: "Evil is no giant staggering through the world at his own whim; somehow, it accomplishes God's will for purifying and disciplining his chosen ones"<sup>(12)</sup>. A similar idea is expressed by Amos (3,6), "If evil (רעה) comes upon a city, has not the Lord caused it (לא עשה)?" It is also borne out by Isaiah in 10,5-20, especially in v. 6, "Against an impious nation [Judah] I send him [Assyria], and against a people under my anger I order him to seize plunder, carry off loot, and tread them down like the mud of streets". What should be noted here is that it is not simply that God permits such punishment of his people by invading enemies; no, he is said to be the cause of the evil that comes to them. Similarly in Judg 2,14-15, "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he handed them over to plunderers who plundered them, and he sold them into the power of their

<sup>(9)</sup> See J.A. SANDERS, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11* (DJD 4; Oxford 1965) 45, 71.

<sup>(10)</sup> Compare the later Syriac version in M. NOTH, "Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen", ZAW 48 (1930) 1-23, esp. 6, 14: *wl' t'lyn bdqšyn mny*, "und bring mich nicht in eine Lage, die zu hart für mich ist". See also F. DÍAZ ESTEBAN, "Confirmación hebrea de que hay una errónea traducción en la versión castellana del Padre nuestro", *Cultura bíblica* 25 (1968) 300-302.

<sup>(11)</sup> The RSV and NRSV render v. 7a: "I make weal and create woe", thus watering down the force of the Hebrew: עשה שלום וברא רע.

<sup>(12)</sup> C. STUHLMEUELLER, "Deutero-Isaiah," *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (ed. R.E. BROWN et al.) (Englewood Cliffs, NJ 1968) 1. 373.

enemies all around so that they could no longer withstand them<sup>(13)</sup>. In all that they undertook, the hand of the Lord was against them for evil". If God, in this way of thinking, is said to be the cause of such evil, then it is conceivable that he would lead them into situations of testing and temptation, even though the immediate source or origin of such testing or temptation is not God himself.

What is at issue in this mode of protological thinking is that there had not yet emerged in the history of ideas the distinction that theologians of later ages made between God's permissive will and his absolute will. As a result, everything that happens to human beings was being attributed to God. Just when that distinction begins to emerge is not easy to say; it was certainly used in the predestinarian debates of the patristic period. Then God was said to allow or permit people to fall into temptation or apostasy, but he did not will it absolutely.

There is evidence of this protological thinking also in the NT, when the inevitable retribution of human sin is ascribed to God's wrath or punitive judgment. For instance, Paul declares in Rom 1,24.26.28 that God delivered (παρέδωκεν) pagans over to impurity, dishonorable passions, and improper conduct. In these verses, Paul is seeking to give a logical explanation of the dire condition in which pagan humanity exists without the gospel; but he does it in a primitive way, echoing the OT mode of ascribing such evil condition to God's decision and action, as a manifestation of his wrath (an attribute of God derived from the OT). Or again, in Rom 9:18, he speaks of God "hardening the heart of whomever he chooses," a reference to Pharaoh, whose heart was hardened by God in Exod 4,21; 7,3; 9,12; 10,20.27; 14,8 (even though other passages tell of evil Pharaoh hardening his own heart: Exod 7,14; 8,15.32)<sup>(14)</sup>. Moreover, in Rom 11,32, Paul asserts that "God has imprisoned all people in disobedience".

Over against such protological thinking, one begins to detect especially in the late writings of the OT a different mode. One instance has already been noted above, when 1 Chr 21,1 is compared with 2 Sam 24,1. In the deuterocanonical writing of Ben Sirā, one notes an insistence on the freedom of the human will: "Do not say, 'It was God's doing that I fell away'; for what he hates he will not do. Do not say, 'It was he who led me astray'; for he has no need of a wicked man" (Sir 15,11-12; see also 15,20).

Paul also has contributed to this different way of thinking when he writes, "No trial has overtaken you but what is human. God is trustworthy, and he will not allow you to be tried (ὅς οὐκ ἔσσει ὑμᾶς πειρασθῆναι) beyond what you can bear; but with the trial he will provide also a way out, so that you may be able to endure it" (1 Cor 10,13). Here one finds God *permitting* his faithful ones to be tried or tempted, and from this mode of phrasing the matter one sees how later interpreters have often sought to soften the wording of the sixth petition of the PN itself.

<sup>(13)</sup> The statement is softened in the NAB, when וימכרם ("and he sold them") is rendered as, "He allowed them to fall into the power of". That is a irresponsible reformulation of the text.

<sup>(14)</sup> See further J.A. FITZMYER, *Romans*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 33; New York 1993) 568.

Finally the statement that temptation comes not from God is clearly formulated in Jas 1,3, "Let no one say when he is tempted, 'I am tempted by God'; for God cannot be tempted with evil and he himself tempts no one" (RSV). However, it must be noted that it is one thing to say that "God tempts no one", and quite another, that God "leads us into temptation", where the implication is clear that God himself is not the source or origin of the temptation, which is the meaning of the statement in James. Moreover, the temptation of which James speaks is that by which one "is lured and enticed by his own desire" (1,14), i.e. which comes from within, whereas the *πειρασμός* of the PN is that which comes from without, as noted above.

#### 4. *The Early Permissive Paraphrase as a Reformulation of the Petition*

The sentiment expressed in 1 Cor 10,13 and Jas 1,13d, however, has occasioned various reformulations of the sixth petition over the ages, beginning soon after it was first recorded by the evangelists. Normally, Greek patristic writers use the text of the Matthean or Lucan Gospels without a change, but Latin writers often have rephrased the petition.

Among such interpreters, Tertullian (A.D. 160-220) quotes the sixth petition as *ne nos inducas in temptationem*; but then he proceeds to explain it by a permissive paraphrase: *id est, ne nos patiaris induci ab eo utique qui temptat* (*De oratione* 8.1; CCLat1.262), "do not allow us to be led into temptation by him who tempts" (15). In writing against Marcion, he again uses the permissive paraphrase:

Quis non sinet nos deduci in temptationem? Quem poterit temptator non timere an qui a primordio temptatorem angelum praedamnavit?, Who is it will not to allow us to be led into temptation? He whom the tempter cannot fear or he who from the beginning has already condemned the angelic tempter? (*Adv. Marcionem* 4.26.5; CCLat 1.615).

From this formulation, scholars have at times deduced that the permissive paraphrase was already pre-Tertullian, and some think that it even was formulated so by Marcion (16).

(15) His text continues: "Ceterum absit ut Dominus temptare uideatur, quasi aut ignoret fidem cuiusque aut deicere sit gestiens. Diaboli est et infirmitas et militia" (*De oratione* 8.2-3; CCLat 1.262; CSEL 20.186). See also *De fuga in persecutione* 2.5 (CCLat 2.1138), where Tertullian considers persecution as the *maior temptatio* and where he explains the seventh petition (*sed erue nos a maligno*) by saying, "id est: ne nos induxeris in temptationem permittendo nos maligno. Tunc enim eruihur diaboli minibus, cum illi non tradamur in temptationem". Again we note the permissive paraphrase.

(16) See J. MOFFATT, "Tertullian on the Lord's Prayer", *Expos* 8/18 (1919) 24-41, esp. 39; A.J.B. HIGGINS, "Lead Us Not into Temptation": Some Latin Variants", *JTS* 46 (1945) 179-183; Id., "Lead Us Not into Temptation", *ExpTim* 58 (1946-47) 250. Marcion's Greek text has been quoted at times as *μη ἄγεις ἡμᾶς εἰσενεχθῆναι εἰς πειρασμόν* (so K. ALAND, *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum* [Stuttgart 1978] 87; cf. B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [Stuttgart 1994] 132). But see P. GRELOT, "L'Arrière-plan araméen du 'Pater'", *RB* 91 (1984) 531-556, esp. 549 n. 41; he maintains that Marcion's text is known to us only from the Latin text of Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 4.26.5.

Although the VL of Matt 6,13 normally read the petition as *ne nos inducas in temptationem, sed libera nos a malo*, at some early stage the permissive paraphrase was introduced into some copies of it, probably from liturgical usage: *ne passus nos fueris induci in temptationem* (MS c [Codex Colbertinus, 12/13th century]); *ne passus fueris induci nos ...* (MS k [Codex Bobiensis, 4/5th century]). These variants are absent from the Lucan form of the petition in the VL, which has only the literal translation of Matt 6,13.

Later, Cyprian (A.D. 200/210-25 8) quotes the sixth petition as *ne patiaris nos induci in temptationem*, without any awareness of the more literal translation (*De oratione Dominica* 25; CCLat 3A. 106)<sup>(17)</sup>. He immediately explains that the adversary can do nothing against us, unless God has first permitted it (“nisi Deus ante permiserit”).

A different permissive paraphrase is found in Hilary of Poitiers (A.D. 315-367/368): *non derelinquas nos in temptatione, quam sufferre non possumus* (*Tract. in Ps. 118, 15*; CSEL 22.369). This is introduced by “quod et in Dominicæ orationis ordine continetur, cum dicitur”, which shows that this was the way Hilary was reciting the sixth petition of the PN. He alludes specifically to 1 Cor 10, 13.

Ambrose (A.D. 339-397) also quotes the petition in the permissive paraphrase traced to Tertullian, *ne patiaris nos induci in temptationem* (*De sacramentis* 5.4.29; CSEL 73.7 1), to which he adds in his explanation “quam ferre non possumus”, again an echo of 1 Cor 10, 13. He states further, however, “non dicit ‘non inducas in temptationem’”, which shows that he was aware that some people were reciting the more literal translation of the petition.

The literal translation of the petition is used, however, by Chromatius of Aquileia (died A.D. 407), *ne nos inducas in tentationem*, but in the course of his explanation of the petition, he introduces a variant of the literal version, *ne nos inferas in tentationem*, “do not bring us into temptation” (*Tract. in Ev. Matthæi* 14.7.1-3; CCLat 9.433-434), which does not change its basic meaning.

The latter form of the petition in Chromatius is the way it is normally used by Augustine of Hippo (A.D. 354-430), *ne nos inferas in temptationem* (*Enchiridion* 30.115; CCLat 46.111; *De peccatorum meritis* 2.2.2; 2.4.4; CSEL 60.72, 74 [line 9]; *De natura et gratia* 53.62 and 68; 67.80; CSEL 60.278, 285, 294; *Contra duas ep. Pelag.* 4.13.27; CSEL 60.446). Augustine was aware, however, of the more usual Latin form, *ne nos inducas in temptationem*, because he notes, “sicuti nonnulli codices habent” (*De peccatorum meritis* 2.4.4; CSEL 60.74 [lines 21-25]–75 [line 2]; *De sermone Domini in monte* 2.9.30; CCLat 3 5.119)<sup>(18)</sup>. He also knew the form of the petition used by “beatissimus Cyprianus”, but he admits that he has never been able to find that form in any of the Greek manuscripts: “in euangelio tamen

<sup>(17)</sup> See J. MOFFATT, “Cyprian on the Lord’s Prayer”, *Expos* 8/18 (1919) 176-189, esp. 186-187. He believes that Cyprian has taken his formulation from the VL, but it obviously corresponds to that of Cyprian’s teacher, Tertullian, to which Cyprian has added the prepositional phrase at the end, perhaps from the VL.

<sup>(18)</sup> See J. MOFFATT, “Augustine on the Lord’s Prayer”, *Expos* 8/18 (1919) 259-272, esp. 270-271. Cf. T. VAN BAVEL, “‘Inferas – inducas’: A propos de Mtth. 6, 13 dans les oeuvres de Saint Augustin”, *RBen* 69 (1959) 348-351.

graeco nusquam... nisi *ne nos inferas* ... (*De dono perseverantiae* 6.12; PL 45. 1000). Augustine also carefully explains that “aliud est autem induci in temptationem, aliud temptari” (*De sermone Domini in monte* 2.9.30) and further distinguishes the sense of πειρασμός: “there is another *tentatio* that is called *probatio*. About this *tentatio* it is written, ‘The Lord your God is testing you, to know whether you love him’ (Deut 13,3bc)” (*Sermo* 57.9; PL 38.390; *Works of Saint Augustine* 313.113; cf *De sermone Domini in monte* 2.9.3 1).

Jerome (A.D. 345-420): *ne inducas nos in temptationem, quam ferre non possumus* (In *Ezekielem* 14.48.16; CCLat 75.735).

Among Greek writers, I shall cite only two. Origen (A.D. 185-254), who apparently knew only the basic Greek form of the sixth petition, says in his treatise on prayer,

πᾶς τοίνυν “ὁ βίος”, καθὼς προεῖρηται, τοῦ “ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς” ἐστὶ “πειρατήριον” [LXX Job 7,1] διόπερ εὐχόμεθα ῥυσθῆναι πειρατηρίου, οὐκ ἐν τῷ μὴ πειράζεσθαι (τοῦτο γὰρ ἀμήχανον, μάλιστα τοῖς “ἐπὶ γῆς”) ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ μὴ ἡττᾶσθαι πειραζομένους... τὸν δὲ ἡττώμενον ἐν τῷ πειράζεσθαι εἰσέρχεσθαι “εἰς” τὸν “πειρασμόν” ἐνεχόμενον τοῖς δικτύοις αὐτοῦ. ὑπολαμβάνω, All ‘life’, then, as it has been said before, ‘of a human being on earth’ is a ‘temptation.’ Therefore we must pray to be delivered from temptation, not in the sense of not being tempted (for that is impossible, especially for those ‘on earth’), but in the sense of not being overcome when tempted. I understand the one who is overcome when tempted to be entering ‘into temptation’, being caught in its nets (*De oratione* 29.9; GCS 2.385). Cf. In *Ps* 17,29: εἰς πειρασμόν οὐκ εἰσέρχεται οὐ τῷ μὴ πειρασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὴ ἁλῶναι ταῖς παγίσιν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ.

A fragment of Dionysius Alexandrinus, if it is genuine, preserves the permissive paraphrase, said to be like that of Marcion, μὴ ἑάσης ἡμᾶς ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν (PG 10.1601).

### 5. A Jewish Parallel to the Petition

From this late period comes also an interesting parallel in a Jewish evening prayer, preserved in the Babylonian Talmud:

ואל תרגילני ליד עבירה ואל תביאני ליד צפא ולא ליד עון ולא ליד נסיון ולא ליד  
בזיון

“Accustom me not to transgression, and lead me not into sin, and not into iniquity, and not into temptation, and not into contempt” (*b. Berakoth* 60b)<sup>(19)</sup>.

In contrast to the late Christian reformulations of the sixth petition, the Jewish prayer preserves the protological thinking of the OT, because it is a prayer addressed to God, asking him not to lead one into such situations. The parallel reveals that the Matthean sixth petition would be at home in a Jewish

<sup>(19)</sup> See *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud: Berakoth* (ed. I. EPSTEIN) (London 1960) 60b; Cf. L. L. GOLDSCHMIDT, *Der babylonische Talmud* (Berlin 1897) 1.224.

context. It is puzzling, however, why so many commentators on the sixth petition cite this parallel as if it were already part of the contemporary Jewish background of Jesus' prayer<sup>(20)</sup>, when it is attested only in a fifth-sixth century talmud, and coming, not from Jesus' homeland, but from faroff Babylon. Since there is no evidence that the prayer already existed in pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism, it has little relevance for the interpretation of the sixth petition of the PN beyond being an interesting parallel of the same protological formulation of later date.

## 6. Modern Reformulations in Romance-Language Countries

The permissive paraphrase of the sixth petition used by ancient writers of the patristic period has led to the reformulation of the petition often used in modern times in some Romance-Language countries. For instance, in pre-Vatican II French it was normally recited as *ne nous laissez pas succomber à la tentation*; or *ne nous laissez pas tomber en tentation*; and even later as *ne nous laisse pas entrer dans la tentation* (Osty-Trinquet, *Bible de Segond* [1978]). In Spanish: *no nos dejes caer en la tentación*. In Catalanian: *no permeteu que caiguem en la temptació*. In Portuguese: *não nos deixeis cair em tentação*. In one form or another, this paraphrase continues to be proposed. The form used by Klary (*non derelinquas nos in temptatione*) has recently been adopted by the Catholic Bishops of Italy: *non abbandonarci in tentazione*<sup>(21)</sup>.

Gnilka rightly noted, however, that if one were to understand the sixth petition merely as a allowance or permission to enter into temptation, one would be weakening the meaning of the Greek text that we have inherited<sup>(22)</sup>. Moreover, one should not attribute to human beings themselves an initiative that the Greek text attributes to God, as Dupont and Bonnard have duly stressed<sup>(23)</sup>.

## 7. Attempts to Justify the Permissive Paraphrase

To defend such a permissive reformulation of the petition, however, some commentators have maintained that one has to ask what the original words of Jesus of Nazareth would have been, for though he may have been able to speak some Greek, the evidence that we have points to his normally

<sup>(20)</sup> So cited by A. GEORGE, "Ne nous soumettons pas à la tentation: Note sur la traduction nouvelle du Notre-Père", *BVC* 71 (1966) 74-79; J. JEREMIAS, "The Lord's Prayer in Modern Research", *ExpTim* 71 (1959-60) 141-146; ID., *The Prayers of Jesus*, 104 (here he says of the talmudic prayer that it "has in view not an unmediated action of God but *his permission which allows something to happen*" [ibid., 105 (my emphasis)]). Yet there is nothing about permission in the talmudic prayer. Jeremias failed to recognize that, beyond its similarity to the sixth petition, it shares with it the protological formulation of the Greek text. He makes the claim about permission because he wants to make this rabbinical quotation support his explanation of the petition itself, which it does not.

<sup>(21)</sup> See also I.M. CECCHERELLI, "Et ne nos inducas in tentationem?", *BeO* 43/1 (2001) 55-68 ("ne in tentationibus nos decipi permittas").

<sup>(22)</sup> See J. GNILKA, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT 1; Freiburg im B. 1986) 226.

<sup>(23)</sup> See DUPONT – BONNARD, "Le Notre-Père: Notes exégétiques", 28. Cf A.-M. ROGUET, "Le nouveau texte français du 'Notre Père'", *VS* 114 (1966) 5-24, esp. 22: "Le grand avantage de la traduction adoptée, c'est qu'elle laisse toute sa valeur à l'action de Dieu, sans la rendre scandaleuse".

teaching in Aramaic<sup>(24)</sup>. The Greek text can be retroverted into contemporary Aramaic as follows: ואל תעלננא לנסיין, *wə'al ta 'ēlinnānā' lēnisyōn*<sup>(25)</sup>. Pace S.E. Porter, however, this Aramaic form of the petition does not change its meaning<sup>(26)</sup>. The aphel form of עלל would mean “cause (someone) to enter”: “do not cause us to enter into temptation”, or “lead us not into temptation”. That is the same sense as the Greek of Matt 6,13 or Luke 1 1,4.

However, J. Carmignac, who claims that Jesus would have formulated the PN not in Aramaic, but in Hebrew, has insisted on such a Semitic substratum. For him, the meaning of the sixth petition would be, “Fais que nous n’entrions pas dans la tentation”, i.e., “bring it about that we do not enter into temptation”. He claims that this is the only possible meaning of the petition<sup>(27)</sup>. Even though one were to agree that the Greek verb translates a Semitic causative (Aramaic, however, and not Hebrew!), such a substratum does not enable one — or even permit one — to move the negative from the causative (aphel) to the simple (peal) form of the verb. A. George recognized that Carmignac’s solution, however plausible it might be in Semitic languages, unduly forces the meaning of Jesus’ words as preserved in Greek<sup>(28)</sup>. Moreover, such an ardent defender of the permissive paraphrase of the petition as R.J. Tournay had to admit that Carmignac’s solution “n’a pas

<sup>(24)</sup> See J.A. FITZMYER, “Did Jesus Speak Greek?” *BAR* 18/5 (1992) 58-63, 76-77.

<sup>(25)</sup> My retroversion basically agrees with that of J. JEREMIAS, which is found in his book, *The Prayers of Jesus*, 94. He vocalizes the verb as *tha 'elinnan*, but that ending of the suffix is characteristic of Late Aramaic (as in Syriac), whereas the contemporary Middle Aramaic ending would rather be *-anā'*. One must always scrutinize Jeremias’s Aramaic, because he invariably uses forms from rabbinic texts of the third and later centuries. See also J. JEREMIAS, “The Lord’s Prayer in Modern Research”, *ExpTim* 71 (1 959-60) 141-146; *Id.*, *The Lords Prayer* (Facet Books, Biblical Series 8; Philadelphia 1964). Although Jeremias retroverts rather well the petition into Aramaic, his explanation of it is another matter: “The meaning is rather: ‘Do not permit that we be overcome by the temptation’” (p. 143); that is hardly correct. Cf. GRELOT, “L’Arrière-plan araméen”, 555.

The Greek verb εἰσφύρω is used in the Theodotion version of Dan 6,19 to translate Aramaic עלל. The noun נסיון, “temptation”, is not yet attested in contemporary Aramaic, but does appear in later Aramaic and Syriac.

<sup>(26)</sup> See PORTER, “Mt 6:13 and Lk 11: 4”, 360: “The meaning of the Aramaic reconstructions is roughly the opposite of what the Greek seems to say.” That might be true, if one follows the explanation given at times to the Aramaic substratum (e.g., Jeremias’ explanation, cited in n. 25 above). Cf. F.H. CHASE, *The Lords Prayer in the Early Church* (Texts and Studies 1/3; Cambridge 1891) 60-70. He supplies the Syriac evidence that supports the Aramaic retroversion and its meaning.

<sup>(27)</sup> See J. CARMIGNAC, “Fais que nous n’entrions pas dans la tentation’: La portée d’une négation devant un verbe au causatif”, *RB* 72 (1965) 218-226; *Id.*, *Recherches sur le “Notre Père”*, 236-304, esp. 279, 292-294. He depends heavily on J. HELLER, “Die Sechste Bitte des Vaterunsers”, *ZKT* 25(1901) 85-93 (translated into French in *Recherches*, 437-445). See also Carmignac’s article, “Hebrew Translations of the Lord’s Prayer: An Historical Survey”, *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor* (ed. G.A. TUTTLE; Grand Rapids, MI 1978) 18-79.

Carmignac has found support from M. DELCOR, “A propos de la traduction oecuménique du ‘Notre Père’”, *BLE* 71 (1970) 127-130; J. M. LOCHMANN, *Unser Vater. Auslegung des Vaterunsers* (Gütersloh 1988) 109-127; I.H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1978) 461-62. However, a number of scholars have hesitated to follow Carmignac: J. DELORME, “Pour une catéchèse biblique du ‘Notre Père’”, *L’Ami du clergé* 75/15 (1966) 225-236.

<sup>(28)</sup> See A. GEORGE, “Ne nous soumet pas”, 78.

été retenue”<sup>(29)</sup>. It did not prove convincing to many interpreters not only because Carmignac sought to establish its Semitic substratum in Hebrew and not in Aramaic, but also because the evidence presented by him in his article, “Fais que nous n’entrions pas” simply is not persuasive. His analysis of 28 examples from the OT and the Qumran Hodayot is interesting, but he himself had to admit that “en beaucoup de circonstances, les deux idées ‘ne pas faire...’ et ‘faire ne pas...’ se confondent en pratique et l’on ne peut guère les distinguer”<sup>(30)</sup>.

The trouble is that the Semitic languages can express the causative sense in one word, using a morphemic change of vowels for the consonantal root, whereas in Indo-European languages one normally has to use a circumlocution to express the causative. Thus the simple (peal) form of Aramaic עלל (*‘alal*) would mean, “he entered,” whereas the causative (haphel) form הנעל (*han‘el*, Dan 6,19) would mean, “be caused to enter” or “he brought in”. The Semitic substratum of the sixth petition, therefore, would mean “do not make us enter”, or “lead us not into”, and not “bring it about that we do not enter”. A good study of this phenomenon has been made by E. Tov, who has analyzed the various ways in which the Hebrew causative form (hiphil) has been translated in the LXX. Even the well-known causative devices in the Greek language, such as the contract verbs, especially those in -όω, or those that add an appendage, such as -ίζω, -άζω or -ύνω, are usually combined with adjectives or nouns, e.g., δικαιοόω (make δίκαιος), θανατόω (mortify), πλεονάζω (make more, multiply), μεγαλύνω (make big)<sup>(31)</sup>. So their function is not the same as the causative morpheme of a Semitic verbal root. In any case, the LXX translations of the Hebrew hiphil do not normally dilute the causative meaning or turn it into a merely permissive nuance.

Jenni has also taken up this question in an erudite article, which analyzes the matter from a technical linguistic point of view<sup>(32)</sup>. After a lengthy discussion, he finally analyzes twelve instances of the Aramaic verb עלל in the Book of Daniel, both in its simple (peal) forms and the causative (haphel)

<sup>(29)</sup> See R.J. TOURNAY, “Que signifie la sixième demande du Notre-Père?”, *RTL* 26 (1995) 299-306, esp. 302; cf. also his article, “‘Ne nous laisse pas entrer en tentation’”, *NRT* 120 (1998) 440-443, esp. 441. Tournay’s form of the Aramaic retroversion (*‘al ta ‘elna lenissayôn* [*RTL* 26.303], later changed to *ta ‘elana* [*NRT* 120.441], which he claims has been “reconstituée par les meilleurs spécialistes de notre temps”, would unfortunately not be recognized by any Aramaist. *Nissayôn* is the Hebrew word for “temptation,” and the Aramaic verb for “enter” has an initial *‘ayin*, not an initial *‘aleph*; his references to JOÜON, *Grammaire de l’hébreu biblique* §54d and § 5 1c say nothing about Aramaic usage or about a permissive sense of the root-verb.

<sup>(30)</sup> See “Fais que nous n’entrions pas”, 219. Cf R.E. BROWN, review of Carmignac’s *Recherches* in *CBQ* 32 (1970) 264-66.

<sup>(31)</sup> See E. TOV, “The Representation of the Causative Aspects of the *Hiph’il* in the LXX: A Study in Translation Technique”, *Bib* 63 (1982) 417-424. There is one instance of a verb, however, in which the formation seems to be similar to that of the causative in Semitic languages: ἀκουτίζω, the causative of ἀκούω, meaning, “cause to hear”. Since his study is confined to the Hebrew causative, Tov does not discuss the causative form of Aramaic עלל of Dan 6,19. Cf B. KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN, “Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Kausativs in der Vulgata”, *ZAW* 85 (1973) 196-219, esp. 202, 210.

<sup>(32)</sup> See E. JENNI, “Kausativ und Funktionsverbgefüge: Sprachliche Bemerkungen zur Bitte: ‘Führe uns nicht in Versuchung’”, *TZ* 48 (1992) 77-88; reprinted in *Studien zur Sprachwelt des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart 1997) 162-173.



forms, esp. Dan 6,19, וַיִּדְחֶנּוּ לֹא-הִנֵּעַל קִדְמוֹי, which literally means, “he did not cause food(?) to come in before him,” but which he translates, “auch liess er keine Frauen zu sich hereinbringen.” This is the place where the LXX uses the verb εἰσφέρω to render the haphel of עלל. Jenni calls the use of εἰσφέρω a synthetic translation (because it is a compound verb, using a prefix εἰς + φέρω in contrast to the analytic translation of the Hebrew hiphil חָבִיֵא in Job 14,3, where the LXX renders it with ἐποίησας εἰσελθεῖν, “you made (me) enter”. Given this distinction, Jenni believes that one is justified in translating the Greek form of the sixth petition with a permissive nuance.

I am fully aware of the fact that many OT scholars translate the Hebrew hiphil with a permissive nuance<sup>(33)</sup>. The question is, whether one rightly introduces such a softening of the text, or rather such a watering down of it. I have already called attention to such a translation in nn. 11 and 13 above. I, for one, am not convinced.

### 8. The Greek Formulation of the Petition

More to the point, however, is the question whether the Semitic substratum of the petition really has anything to do with the problem of the meaning of the sixth petition<sup>(34)</sup>. The Aramaic *ta'ēlinnānā* is a modern retroversion, which, though it may be considered correct, is hypothetical; and it is not part of the transmitted PN or of the Christian heritage, which comes to us only in Greek. The meaning of the Greek verb μὴ εἰσενέγκης is clear: “do not lead into” or “do not bring into.” It has no causative nuance, such as that claimed by those who argue for its Semitic *Vorlage*, beyond what it actually says. Hence, all attempts to explain away its obvious meaning by an appeal to its Semitic causative substratum is a subterfuge pure and simple, especially when that causative is then given a permissive nuance. All the traditional attempts to reformulate the petition in terms of not allowing or not permitting Christians to be led into temptation (or be put to the final test) are simply a manipulation of the PN that we have inherited. It is a gross tampering with the words of Jesus himself as transmitted to us in the inspired Scriptures.

### 9. The Pastoral Problem of Explanation

The pastoral problem is one of interpretation and explanation. It is necessary, first, to explain that, though the sixth petition ascribes to God some causality in “leading” people into temptation (or to the final eschatological test), it does not depict God as the source or origin of that temptation or test. Second, the petition does not mean that God is tempting us, or that “God is impelling human beings to sin”, as Tournay has understood its literal

<sup>(33)</sup> See B.K. WALTKE – M. O'CONNOR, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN 1990) 445.

<sup>(34)</sup> In this I agree with S.E. PORTER (“Mt 6:13 and Lk 11:4”, 360), when he says that “it is far from obvious that this prayer must or can be understood on Semitic terms alone”. Similarly M. GIELEN, “‘Und führe uns nicht in Versuchung’: Die 6. Vater-Unser Bitte — eine Anfechtung für das biblische Gottesbild?”, *ZNW* 89 (1998) 201-216, esp. 202-204; F.J. BOTHA, “Recent Research on the Lord's Prayer”, *Neotest.* 1 (1967) 42-50, esp. 48.

translation<sup>(35)</sup>, because of what has been said in the first point. It is, indeed, possible to recite the sixth petition and accept fully the statement of Jas 1, 13, that “God tempts no one” (quoted in full and explained above). As Augustine put it, “It is one thing to be led into temptation, another to be tempted” (see §IV above). Third, it is essential to recall that Jesus himself, being a child of his time, used a customary protological mode of expression about God’s activity, such as one finds often enough in the OT, and that he has counseled us to pray to the Father, “Lead us not into temptation”. Fourth, the customary counting of the petitions in the PN as seven has led to the separation of the sixth petition from the seventh, when in reality they are two parts of the same request. The seventh petition, although missing in the Lucan form of the PN (11,4), balances the sixth. Indeed, it may well be the earliest attempt to explain the difficult phrasing of the sixth petition. Being the only one expressed negatively in the PN, the sixth prepares for the seventh, which in the long run is more important, “But deliver us from evil (or from the Evil One)”<sup>(36)</sup>. Fifth, it is good to repeat the remark of Paul, “No trial has overtaken you but what is human. God is trustworthy, and he will not allow you to be tried beyond what you can bear; but with the trial he will provide also a way out, so that you may be able to endure it” (1 Cor 10, 13). That explains the collocation of the sixth and seventh petitions of the PN. Sixth, one must recall the good effects that may come from *πειρασμός* as divine testing, and God has the responsibility for the good that may come, and consequently even of its onset<sup>(37)</sup>. Seventh, it is the Jesus who counseled his disciples, “Stay awake and pray that you enter not into temptation (ἵνα μὴ ἔλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν); the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak” (Mark 14,3 8; cf. Matt 26,4 1; Luke 22,40.46), who also counsels them continually to say to God the Father, “and lead us not into temptation”<sup>(38)</sup>. Eighth, is it right to ask God to refrain from doing something?<sup>(39)</sup> When one asks such a question, one must recall the example of the great patriarch of Israel, Abraham who pleaded with God on behalf of wicked Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen 18,23-32. Finally, it must be recalled that the fidelity of a human being to God comes not from human achievement or merit. When one prays not to be led into enticing situations or those of distress or affliction, one acknowledges one’s frailty and dependence on God and his grace<sup>(40)</sup>.

Catholic University of America  
Washington, DC 20064 (USA)

Joseph A. FITZMYER

<sup>(35)</sup> See TOURNAY, “Ne nous laisse pas”, 440.

<sup>(36)</sup> See HIGGINS, “Lead Us Not into Temptation”, *JTS* 46 (1945) 179.

<sup>(37)</sup> See DAHMS, “Lead Us Not into Temptation”, 223-230.

<sup>(38)</sup> “Le sens de l’ensemble [of the sixth and seventh petitions] est donc celui-ci: ‘Ne nous soumettons pas à l’épreuve, mais (si tu juges nécessaire de nous y soumettre, nous qui connaissons notre fragilité, nous te demandons alors que cette épreuve tourne à notre bien) délivre-nous du Mal!’ (ROGUET, “Le nouveau texte”, 22).

<sup>(39)</sup> See G.B. VERITY, “Lead Us Not into Temptation but...”, *ExpTim* 58 (1946- 47) 221-222; cf. C.L. RICHARDS, “Lead Us Not into Temptation”, *ibid.*, 59 (1947-48) 24-25.

<sup>(40)</sup> See further A. BAUR, “Lead Us Not into Temptation”, *New Blackfriars* 52 (1971) 64-69; H. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, *Understanding the Lord’s Prayer* (New York 1963) 130- 137;

## SUMMARY

The sixth petition of the "Our Father" has been translated in various ways across the centuries. This article discusses its literal meaning and the permissive paraphrases of it, explaining the sense of "temptation" and God's activity in "leading" into it, as well as the various subterfuges adopted to avoid the obvious meaning of the Greek formulation, including its supposed Aramaic substratum. It concludes with a pastoral explanation of the petition.

---

P.S. CAMERON, "Lead Us Not into Temptation", *ExpTim* 101 (1989-90) 299-301; L. CARDELLINO, "Il 'Padre nostro' (Mt 6,9-13)", *BeO* 41 (1999) 129-207, esp. 192-197; F.C. GRANT, *Introduction to New Testament Thought* (Nashville, TN 1950) 208; C.B. HOUK, "Πειρασμός, the Lord's Prayer, and the Massah Tradition", *SJT* 19 (1966) 216-225; T.W. MANSON, "The Lord's Prayer", *BJRL* 38 (1955-56) 99-113; T. NÈVE, "La nouvelle traduction française du 'Notre Père'", *Paroisse et liturgie* 48 (1966) 73-78; M. PHILONENKO, "La sixième demande du 'Notre Père' et le livre des *Jubilés*", *RHPR* 78/2 (1998) 27\*-37\* (mispaginated); W. POPKES, "Die letzte Bitte des VaterUnser: Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zum Gebet Jesu", *ZNW* 81 (1990) 1-20; W. POWELL, "Lead Us Not into Temptation", *ExpTim* 67 (1955-56) 177- 178; G. ROMANIELLO, *Interpretazione autentica del "Pater Noster"*. I limiti del potere di Satana (Latina 2001) 101-143; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *All things Are Possible to Believers*. Reflections on the Lord's Prayer and the Sermon on the Mount (Louisville, KY 1995) 88; H.-J. STOEBE, "Überlegungen zur sechsten Bitte des Vaterunsers", *TZ* 48 (1992) 89-99; G.G. WILLIS, "Lead Us Not into Temptation", *Downside Review* 93 (1975) 281-288; H.R. WILSON, "And Lead Us Not into Temptation", *Theology* 37 (1938) 302-304.

## Note sur le manuscrit T ou 029 du Nouveau Testament

Le manuscrit T ou 029 du Nouveau Testament<sup>(1)</sup> est un bilingue gréco-copte, très mutilé, qui contient des fragments des évangiles de Luc et de Jean. Il est dispersé actuellement entre trois bibliothèques: New York, Pierpont Morgan Library; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France; Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Je fournis ici quelques précisions concernant les feuillets conservés au Vatican.

Le *Vaticanus Borgianus copticus* 109 regroupe dans une série de fascicules, rangés dans des «cassettes» de bois, une série notable de fragments, surtout coptes. Le fascicule 65,1, rangé dans la cassette 18, contient les fragments de l'évangile de Luc, et le fascicule 65,2, rangé dans la cassette 7, les fragments de l'évangile de Jean. Jusqu'aux années vingt du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle, les fragments de Luc étaient conservés non reliés dans la cassette 18 et ceux de Jean étaient reliés dans un volume couvert de parchemin blanc, placé dans la cassette 7; entre les feuillets originaux étaient intercalés de minces feuillets de parchemin vierge, si bien que le volume comptait 31 feuillets, dont 13 feuillets originaux. C'est ces fragments non reliés et ce volume que décrit en détail P. Franchi de' Cavalieri<sup>(2)</sup> sous la cote Borg. copt. 109,65. C'est toujours le même état que suppose la notice consacrée au codex T dans les *Specimina* de P. Franchi de' Cavalieri et Ioh. Lietzmann<sup>(3)</sup>, où le feuillet reproduit, qui contient Jn 7, 32-39, est désigné comme «fol. 21<sup>v</sup>». Toutefois, peu de temps avant la rédaction du catalogue, le volume avait été démonté et les feuillets originaux soigneusement restaurés<sup>(4)</sup>. A un moment donné, les feuillets de parchemin blancs furent éliminés, si bien qu'on procéda à plusieurs essais d'une nouvelle numérotation des feuillets restants: dans l'une, les chiffres, inscrits dans l'angle supérieur externe des feuillets, étaient d'une unité supérieure à la foliotation suivie par P. Franchi de' Cavalieri dans son catalogue<sup>(5)</sup>; une autre, inscrite mécaniquement dans l'angle inférieur externe des feuillets a été grattée et remplacée par une numérotation au crayon qui va du f. 2 au f. 14 et ne respecte pas l'ordre exact des feuillets.

Comme ces foliotations fautives et peu visibles ne peuvent qu'induire en erreur les lecteurs, nous nous sommes décidé à en exécuter une nouvelle, mécanique, inscrite dans l'angle inférieur externe des feuillets, qui respecte l'ordre correct du texte et va de 1 à 13. Un nouveau microfilm a été fait, sur

(<sup>1</sup>) K. ALAND, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin – New York 1994) 22.

(<sup>2</sup>) P. FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, *Codices graeci Chisiani et Borgiani* (Romae 1927) 141-143.

(<sup>3</sup>) P. FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI – IOH. LIETZMANN, *Specimina codicum graecorum Vaticanorum* (Berolini – Lipsiae 1929) VII n° 3.

(<sup>4</sup>) FRANCHI DE' CAVALIERI, *Codices*, 142: «Hae membranae pessum iturae nuper reffectae sunt in officina glutinatorum Bybliothecae Vaticanae».

(<sup>5</sup>) D'où la perplexité de H. J. VOGEL, *Codicum Novi Testamenti Specimina* (Bonnae 1929) 12 sous le n° 46: «fol. 21 (22 ?)<sup>v</sup> + 22 (23 ?)<sup>v</sup>».

lequel cette foliotation est bien visible. Mais, pour ne pas supprimer un témoignage historique, nous n'avons pas effacé les anciens numéros. On trouvera ci-dessous une table de concordance entre les trois foliotations utilisées dans la littérature érudite récente qui a cité le manuscrit, avec indication du contenu de chacune des pages grecques.

Les 8 feuillets de l'évangile de Luc ne posent heureusement pas le même problème: ils ont conservé leur numérotation de 1 à 8 et contiennent Lc 22,23 à 23,2<sup>(6)</sup>.

Table de concordance des numéros des ff. du Borg.  
copt. 109, cass.7, fasc. 65,2

catal.	crayon	mécán.	contenu		
5v	2v	1v	Jn 6,28-34	πρὸς αὐτὸν	παντότε
7v	3v	2v	34-42	δὸς ἡμῖν	ἔλεγον οὐχ
9v	5v	3v	42-51	οὗτός ἐστιν	ζήσει
11v	6v	4v	51-58	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
13v	4v	5v	59-67	ταῦτα εἶπεν	ὑπάγειν
15v	7v	6v	7,6-15	οὐπω πάρεστιν	οἶδεν μὴ
17v	8v	7v	15-23	μεμαθηκώς	ἐν σαββάτῳ
19v	9v	8v	24-32	μὴ κρίνετε	ἀπέστειλαν
21v	10v	9v	32-39	οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς	ὅτι Ἰησοῦς
23v	12v	10v	39-49	οὐδέπω	ὁ μὴ γινώσκων
25v	13v	11v	49-8,16	τὸν νόμον	κρίσις ἢ ἐμὴ
27v	11v	12v	8,16-23	ἀληθινή	ὑμεῖς ἐκ
29v	14v	13v	23-31	τούτου τοῦ	μαθηταί μου

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana  
I - 00120 Città del Vaticano

Paul CANART

<sup>(6)</sup> Ce que n'indique pas ALAND, *Kurzgefasste Liste*, 22, n.4, bien qu'il mentionne, dans le corps du texte, l'existence des 8 feuillets de la cassette 18.

# RECENSIONES

## Vetus Testamentum

Timothy M. WILLIS, *The Elders of the City*. A Study of the Elders-Laws in Deuteronomy (SBLMS 55). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xiii-353 p. 15,5 × 23,5. \$45.00

The primary purpose of this book is to interpret the five Deuteronomic (Dtn) laws mentioning city elders (Deut 19,1-13; 21,1-9; 18-21; 22,13-21 and 25,5-10) in the light of ethnographic studies of local leadership in various kinship-based societies, especially of the segmentary lineage type. Comparative data are derived from the Middle East and Africa. These are coupled with ancient Near Eastern evidence drawn mainly from cuneiform law codes. The extensive nature of these comparisons sets the book apart from previous studies of the elders in Deuteronomy.

The result is a significant challenge to the critical opinion that judicial authority traditionally held by city elders and a centrally appointed judiciary were mutually exclusive (35). The assumption that elders and judges carried out identical judicial functions is unproven (43). Willis concludes, e.g., that in Deut 19,1-13 the Dtn writers regarded the elders as normally responsible for determining whether a killing was accidental or deliberate and of deciding how long exile from one's native city should be in the case of unintended homicide. But difficult cases could be handed over to non-local judicial functionaries (cf. Deut 17,8-9), as in contemporary kin-based societies (134).

Willis's study leads him to reject the view that opposition between the roles of elders and judges in Israel's legal system can be used as a diachronic marker in the composition of Dtn law (82-83). A good example of this perspective is visible in his analysis of Deut 21,1-9. He follows scholarly consensus in finding a pre-Dtn law in 21,1a\*.b.2-5a\*.6-8a\*.b. But he questions the grounds for removal of "your judges" from the putative original layer in v. 2 because "the complementarity of local elders and appointed officials is most obvious in inter-village matters" in ethnographic analogs (150). The assumption that the mention of "priests, the sons of Levi" (v. 5) is secondary to the original layer also comes under scrutiny. In fact, the participation of additional functionaries in a case of potential inter-village conflict makes good sense. Judges prevent one lineage from inappropriately placing liability on another, and priests are potential witnesses to the oath given by the elders who are liable (157). The primary innovation of the Dtn supplements is to contribute a national perspective, but the final law continues to demand that the matter be dealt with locally (159).

Willis has made an important contribution to the study of biblical law by calling into question the idea that a professional judiciary necessarily negates the juridical competence of local elders in ancient Israel. His study is thorough, but it could be more nuanced. The rest of this review is devoted to suggesting qualifications to what is basically a sensible thesis.

Willis assumes that both the pre-Dtn elders-laws and their primary Dtn and/or Deuteronomistic redactions reflect pre-exilic conditions. But connections to Deuteronomy's agenda of centralization are underplayed. Willis claims, however, that the basic intent of Dtn expansions is to extend the ethical principles underlying the elders-laws to the nation as a whole (309). It is possible to connect such a nationalistic program to centralization, though Willis has not done so.

At times Willis seems reluctant to admit that the establishment of a professional judiciary in Israel may have placed limitations on the customary powers of family and city leaders, though comparative data points to this possibility (52-54). Deut 19,1-13 is a case in point. Willis thinks that the Dtn writers reworked a pre-existing law (vv. 2a.3b-5.11-12), which itself was a commentary on Exod 21,12-14 (143). A particular difficulty is that he suggests the pre-Dtn layer included the mention of the asylum cities in v. 2a, a motif that Dtn expansions are supposed to pick up in v. 7 (115).

Willis is too hasty to endorse the idea that asylum cities may have belonged to laws on accidental homicide in Israel from early times (120). His thesis is problematic on the same grounds he elsewhere uses effectively: ethnographic parallels. In ancient Greece, there is evidence that hospitality for the (refugee) stranger originally depended neither on touching a sacred object nor in reaching a specially designated space, but on the good will of a woman in her home or of a man in the community (C. Auffarth, "Protecting Strangers: Establishing a fundamental value in the Religions of the Ancient Near East and Ancient Greece", *Numen* 39 [1992] 202). Similarly, earliest references to sanctuary in the medieval West indicate not particular places but revered individuals as the primary objects of refuge and assistance (G. Rosser, "Sanctuary and Social Negotiation in Medieval England", *The Cloister and the World*. FS. B. Harvery [ed. J. Blair - B. Golding] [New York 1996] 61).

Someone seeking asylum would be most certain of protection under the aegis of a prominent citizen (i.e., elder). But the distressed stranger in early biblical culture was probably dependent on the good will of the person approached. Otherwise, why the need for recurrent instruction about the care of the *ger*, the resident alien (e.g., Exod 22,20; 23,9; Deut 14,29; 16,11.14, etc.)? Further, an absolute obligation of the householder to protect the stranger is not assumed in the speeches of the lustful populace in Gen 19,5 or Judg 19,22. Nor, for that matter, does Jael come under opprobrium when she betrays the trust of the supplicating Sisera in Judg 4,21.

These observations make an early origin for the cities of asylum dubious. One function of the appointment of official places of refuge would be to take responsibility for the security of refugees out of the whim of city elders. In fact, the laws on accidental homicide in the Bible (Exod 21,12-14; Num 35; Deut 19,1-13; Jos 20,1-6) probably point to a number of attempts in ancient Israel (not all of which can be harmonized as Willis notes [131]) to address

not only the problem of arbitrary revenge but also of arbitrary protection. Such initiatives presuppose the existence of judicial authority above the level of the city elders intent on checking some of their powers. The asylum cities are most likely a Dtn innovation, necessary because an earlier institution (cf. Exod 21,13) was eclipsed by the centralization of legitimate sacrifice.

Another example of Willis's hesitation about official limitations on traditional legal customs may be found in his analysis of the Middle Assyrian laws (MAL) regarding adultery. He disagrees with E. Otto who holds that these laws demonstrate a transfer of authority from the head of the household to municipal judicial functionaries. Willis claims that it is just as logical to assume that some of the impersonal third plural constructions used in these cases refer to the offended husband's/father's family (200). If so, then the thesis of diachronic change in the administration of such laws would disappear. But the sophistication of Otto's arguments is overlooked. Otto not only points to the wording of the laws but to their complex patterns of organization to make the case for legal reformation. For example, Otto shows that the frame around laws assuming the legal competence of family heads in MAL §§ 14-16 provides a context of interpretation which effectively limits their legal authority in favour of public officials (E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [BZAW 284; Berlin 1999] 196-200). Otto's viewpoint is not adequately addressed.

Willis also misses details that would strengthen his interpretations. This is particularly visible with respect to the penalty of stoning in Deut 21,18-21 and 22,13-21. In the case of Deut 21,18-21, cross-cultural evidence suggests that it is unlikely Israelite fathers had absolute authority of life and death over their children. This authority probably always rested in the hands of the community elders (176). The parents are most likely motivated by social coercion arising from a widespread opinion that the person in question has proven to be a liability to the community as well as to his immediate family. So they hand their son over for judgment for the sake of communal solidarity as well as their own reputations. The elders ensure that the penalty meted out preserves and restores public order and integrity (181).

But why does the law call for stoning? Willis suggests that filial rebellion has religious overtones (180); but there may be a more practical reason. This is indicated by the traditional obligation for revenge in the case of the homicide of a family member. Community unrest may ensue when there are identifiable perpetrators. Clearly, the parents do not want to kill their own child, but neither does anyone in the village want to be identified as the killer. The law may mandate stoning precisely because it resolves this dilemma. While stoning has sacral overtones, 21,18-21 does not explicitly mention contact with *sancta*. The penalty recommends itself for another reason: controlled anonymity in the course of administering the extreme penalty. As such it is an appropriate judicial sentence to be overseen by the elders who are charged with keeping the order of the community and reducing tensions between households.

Willis concludes that it is inappropriate to characterize the intent of the pre-Dtn law in 22,13-21 as a move to restrict the authority of household leaders. Such cases naturally come before the city elders because they entail disputes between two families. The resolutions that the law provides have the



effect of precluding any additional hostilities between the families represented by the woman's father and her husband (232). Here again, his viewpoint could be strengthened by considering the implications of mandating stoning at the door of the father's house (vv. 20-21). Though repudiated by her immediate family, the woman's death could still be the cause for a vendetta. The elders oversee execution by stoning as a way of imposing the ultimate sanction in the community while implicating no one in particular.

Willis's study of ethnographic parallels to the institution of the levirate addressed in Deut 25,5-10 makes a useful distinction between true levirate marriage, in which children engendered by a widow's levir are regarded as offspring of her first husband, and problems involving widow inheritance (236). The cases of Tamar (Genesis 38) and Ruth are also discussed. He concludes that no society makes the levirate an absolute obligation; that the field of candidates from which a levir may come varies; that the widow commonly has some say about whom she will marry; and that the institution involves intertwining economic and social motivations (281-282). From these general principles, Willis deduces that a variety of intersecting conditions led the lawmaker to impose levirate marriage as an obligation rather than an option in Deut 25,5-10.

But why assume that the woman is at imminent risk of marrying an outsider (288-289), when the law does not state this? It is simply the case that the undivided estate must remain intact from the point of view of the Israelite legislator in such circumstances. Consequently, levirate marriage is required. Structurally, the law proceeds from stating its general premises in vv. 5-6 to the special case in vv. 7-10. This conditional construction entertains the possibility that the levirate marriage would be refused by the surviving brother. Its shaming sanctions verge on hyperbole. Here the special case proves the rule and emphasizes the importance that the law-maker gave to keeping the undivided estate intact.

An intriguing aspect of Willis's study is found in off-hand comments that underscore differences between the social outlook of the elder laws in Deuteronomy and their cuneiform parallels. So, e.g., he concludes from his discussion of Deut 19,1-13 that the ancient Israelites were more "rural" than "urban" in their conceptions of obligations to one's lineage and honour (143). In the case of the levirate, he observes a distinction between the preoccupation of cuneiform law with economic consequences for the survivors and a concern for the status of the dead found in present-day societies as well as ancient Israel (250). It would be unreasonable to expect such observations to be fully worked out in this book. But they suggest that Willis possesses additional anthropological insights not fully presented. It is to be hoped that such tantalizing remarks will be developed in the future.

Queen's Theological College  
Kingston ON Canada K7L 3N6

William MORROW

Zipora TALSHIR, *1 Esdr: A Text Critical Commentary* (SBLSCS 50). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2001. xiv-556 p. 16 × 23,5. \$67.95

Talshirs textkritischer Kommentar zum 1 Esdr (in Deutschland auch "3. Esra") ist die praktische Anwendung ihrer früheren Untersuchung *1 Esdras. From Origin to Translation* (Diss. Hebrew University Jerusalem 1984, hebr.). Diese erschien 15 Jahre später, leicht überarbeitet, in englischer Übersetzung: Z. Talshir, *1 Esdras. From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta 1999). Die Dissertation war damals ein echter Fortschritt in der Forschung zu 1 Esdr, da sie erstmals den textlichen Charakter der hebräisch-aramäischen Vorlage einigermaßen zutreffend einschätzte und vor allem die Vorgangsweise des griechischen Übersetzers herausarbeitete. Der Rezensent hat sich Anfang der neunziger Jahre die Dissertation, da die englische Ausgabe so lange auf sich warten ließ, wegen ihrer hohen Qualität noch privat in großen Passagen aus dem Hebräischen ins Deutsche übersetzt.

Das hier zu besprechende neue Buch bietet, wie der Titel schon andeutet, einen versweisen textkritischen Kommentar zu 1 Esdr. Dabei wird jeweils in der linken Spalte der griechische Text, wie ihn die Göttinger Ausgabe von 1974 (Hanhart) rekonstruiert, abgedruckt; in der rechten Spalte erscheinen die Konsonanten des MT, soweit er dem Esdrastext parallelgeht (2 Chr 35–36; Esr 1–10; Neh 8). In Klammern werden überall dort, wo die Vorlage von 1 Esdr von MT abzuweichen scheint, hebräische bzw. aramäische Rekonstruktionen des Vorlagetextes vorgeschlagen. Esdrastexte, die im MT keine Parallele haben, wie 1 Esdr 1,21–22 und die Pagenerzählung 1 Esdr 3,1–5,6 werden frei rückübersetzt. Das Kapitel über die Pagenerzählung verantwortet T. zusammen mit David Talshir. Den Autoren ist wohlbewusst, dass eine solche freie Retroversion rein hypothetisch und in ihrem wissenschaftlichen Wert diskutierbar bleibt. Die Rekonstruktion des hebräisch-aramäischen Vorlagetextes von 1 Esdr, die das Hauptanliegen des Buches ist (vgl. XII), erfolgt in den übrigen Teilen des 1 Esdr, die eine Parallele in MT haben, durch einen Vergleich des griechischen Textes von 1 Esdr mit dem entsprechenden MT. Gemäß den von T. 1984 erhobenen Wiedergabeprinzipien des griechischen Übersetzers wägt sie ab, ob der Vorlagetext wie MT gelaute haben kann oder nicht. Wenn nicht, rekonstruiert sie eine abweichende Vorlage. Diese Rekonstruktionen sind meistens plausibel, und sie sind für alle, die sich mit 1 Esdr wissenschaftlich beschäftigen, außerordentlich nützlich.

Der textkritische Kommentar wendet die in der Dissertation von 1984 gewonnenen Erkenntnisse praktisch an. Insofern ergänzen sich beide Publikationen gegenseitig, und man kann es sogar als einen Vorteil für die Benutzer betrachten, dass in dem neuen Werk kaum Meinungsänderungen erkennbar sind. So kann man die beiden Werke als eine Einheit betrachten. Allerdings liegen hier auch die Grenzen des Gesamtwerks. Bei der erst 1999 erschienenen englischen Ausgabe der Dissertation haben Rezensenten schon kritisch angemerkt, dass die inzwischen weitergegangene Diskussion über 1 Esdr praktisch überhaupt nicht aufgenommen war (vgl. z.B. M. Rösel, ZAW 112 [2000] 481). Dasselbe ist nun leider auch von diesem textkritischen

Kommentar von 2001 zu sagen: Das Buch ist kein wirklicher Fortschritt über das Jahr 1984 hinaus.

Das zeigt schon ein Blick auf die Literatur, die T. benutzt. Ihre Diskussionspartner sind fast durchweg die alten Autoren Ewald, Guthe, Bertholet, Jahn, Torrey, Bayer, Walde, Bewer (alle zwischen 1880 und 1922) und W. Rudolph (*Esra und Nehemia* [HAT I 20; Tübingen 1949]). Mit moderneren Autoren wie S. Mowinckel, *Studien zu dem Buche Esra-Nehemia I, II, III* (SNVAO.HF 3,5,7; Oslo 1964 und 1965), R.W. Klein, *Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler* (Diss. Harvard 1966), K.F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum dritten Esra* (FRLANT 104; Göttingen 1970), H.G.M. Williamson, *Esra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco 1985), A. Schenker, "La relation d'Esdras A' au texte massorétique d'Esdras-Néhémie", *Tradition of the Text* (Hrsg. G.J. Norton - S. Pisano) (OBO 109; Fribourg – Göttingen 1991) 218-248, D. Böhler, *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras α und Esra-Nehemia* (OBO 158; Fribourg – Göttingen 1997), diskutiert sie nicht. Den vorzüglichen Esra-Kommentar von A. Gunneweg, *Esra* (KAT 19/1; Gütersloh 1985), kennt sie gar nicht. Genau genommen diskutiert sie auch mit den alten Autoren nicht wirklich. Sie gibt auch ihnen gegenüber eher einfach ihre eigene Auffassung kund. Da diese aus hoher Kompetenz stammt, stört das Leser, die sich auskennen, kaum. Problematisch wird alles allerdings an den schwierigen und umstrittenen Stellen.

Ein Beispiel ist etwa die Behandlung der Textdifferenz zwischen Esr 4,9 und 1 Esdr 2,16. In Esr 4,9 heißt es: "Rechum, der Befehlshaber, Schimschai, der Schreiber, und ihre übrigen Kollegen, Dinäer (דִּנְיָאִי), Afarsatchäer, Tarpeläer, Perser (?), Urukiter, Babylonier, Schuschaniter, das sind Elamiter, und die übrigen Völker ...". Dagegen lautet 1 Esdr 2,16: "Rechum, der Berichterstatter, Schimschai, der Schreiber und die übrigen ihres Rats und Richter (κρίται דִּנְיָאִי) von Cölesyrien ...". Die meisten Kommentatoren halten Esr 4,8-11 für sekundär erweitert und Esr 4,9 für eine ursprüngliche Beamtenliste, die wie 1 Esdr 2,16 von Richtern sprach (W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, 36, 42; A. Gunneweg, *Esra*, 89; D. Böhler, *Die heilige Stadt*, 224). Sie wurde in MT offensichtlich um sechs Völkerschaften erweitert, wobei sogar die alten "Richter" zu einem siebten Volk von "Dinäern" wurden. T. weiß aus ihren grundsätzlichen Studien, dass der griechische Übersetzer von 1 Esdr die Elemente seiner Vorlage treu wiederzugeben pflegt. Nur deswegen kann sie ja aus einem Vergleich der Übersetzung mit MT auf übereinstimmende oder abweichende Vorlage schließen. Doch in diesem Fall kommt sie zu folgendem textkritischen Urteil: "The evidence of 1 Esd might have led to the conclusion that the list of peoples is a later addition in Ezr; however, the fact that 1 Esd has a remnant of this list in κρίται דִּנְיָאִי indicates otherwise" (108). Und erneut auf Seite 109: "1 Esd scarcely attests to an original text that did not refer to the settlers of Samaria, since κρίται (sic statt κριται) proves otherwise". Aber wieso "beweist" nach der Aufzählung der anderen Amtsleute die Nennung der Richter, dass 1 Esdr eine Vorlage hatte, die Völkerschaften aufzählte? Das textkritische Urteil wird nicht weiter mit einem Argument versehen. T. geht auch auf keinen einzigen anderen Autor ein. Warum ihr alles evident zu sein scheint, lässt sich vielleicht benennen. Die Textdifferenzen in 1Esdr 2,15-16 // Esr 4,8-11 könnten nämlich mit der Differenz der Textabfolge zusammenhängen: 1 Esdr

2,15-25 (// Esr 4,6-24) folgt nicht auf den Esr 2,1–4,5, sondern auf den Esr 1 entsprechenden Abschnitt. Talshirs textkritische Entscheidung ist also wohl logisch abhängig von einer literarkritischen These. Nach ihr wäre die Textanordnung von MT ursprünglicher als die von 1 Esdr. Da diese These fordert, dass hier in 1 Esdr, nicht aber in Esr MT, eine Textumstellung vorliegt (105), ergibt sich notwendig, dass nicht ein Redaktor von MT in seinen Text eingegriffen hat.

Ähnlich gelagert ist der Fall von 1 Esdr 9,49 (Neh 8,9). In 1 Esdr 9,49 heißt es: „Und sagte Hattirates (=Hattirschata) zu Esra“. In MT lautet die Stelle: „Und sagte Nehemia, das ist Hattirschata, und Esra“. 1 Esdr hat, wie T. richtig schreibt, „Nehemia, das ist“ in seiner Vorlage nicht gelesen. Sie bestreitet auch nicht die Auffassung der meisten Kommentatoren, dass Nehemias Name in Neh 8,9 erst eingefügt wurde, als die Verlesung der Tora durch Esra (Neh 8) mit den Nehemiamemoiren vereint wurde: „The original text may have spoken of an anonymous governor ..., who was identified as Nehemiah, when the reading of the Law was inserted into his memoirs“ (495). Der ältere Text lautete also faktisch wie 1 Esdr, MT ist sekundär, und die Textänderung hängt mit der literarkritischen Frage der Vereinigung von Esra- und Nehemiaerzählung zusammen. Und doch ist Talshirs textkritisches Urteil dann: „The assumption that the Tirshata was originally anonymous does not necessarily mean that 1 Esd preserves the original reading, since the author of 1 Esd may have deliberately avoided Nehemiah“ (495). Das führt zu einer interessanten Gesamtsicht: 1 Esdr hat einen Text, der exakt lautet wie der angenommene Originaltext, aber 1 Esdr *ist* nicht der Originaltext, er lautet nur so. Als „Begründung“ gibt Talshir ausdrücklich ihre literarkritische Gesamtthese an: Da 1 Esdr die Nehemiaerzählung aus Esr-Neh herausgestrichen hat, muss er auch den Namen Nehemias in 9,49 (Neh 8,9) getilgt haben. Die umgekehrte textkritische Annahme, die Vorlage von 1 Esdr 9,49 habe den Namen Nehemias gar nicht enthalten, würde ja dafür sprechen, dass 1 Esdr (ebenso wie Josephus, *Ant.* XI 1-183) die Verbindung von Esra- und Nehemiaerzählung nie vor sich gehabt hätte. Die logische Abfolge der Methoden fordert also, dass 1 Esdr 9,49 einen Text bietet, der zwar präzise wie der ursprüngliche Text lautet, aber doch nicht der ursprüngliche Text ist.

Ein ähnliches Problem: Beide Versionen, 1 Esdr ebenso wie Esr-Neh, parallelisieren den Altarbau durch Serubbabel (Esr 3) und die Verlesung der Tora durch Esra (Neh 8) mittels einer fast wortgleichen Einleitung (Esr 3,1 und Neh 7,72b; 8,1). Der Schilderung der Verlesung der Tora durch Esra gehen aber in den beiden Versionen unterschiedliche Texte voraus: In Esr-Neh ist es die Wiederholung der Heimkehrerliste aus Esr 2 (= Neh 7). Ihren Schluss bildet die Bemerkung Neh 7,72a: „Und es ließen sich nieder die Priester und die Leviten und die Torwächter und die Sänger und ein Teil des Volkes (der Laien) und die Tempelsklaven und ganz Israel in ihren Städten“. Dieser Listenschluss ist mitsamt der Liste eine Wiederholung aus Esr 2. Neh 7,72a entspricht Esr 2,70. Ganz anders in 1 Esdr! Hier geht der Verlesung der Tora durch Esra nicht die Heimkehrerliste, sondern die Liste der in illegitimer Mischehe Verheirateten voraus (1 Esdr 9,18-37a // Esr 10,18-44). So wie der Beginn der folgenden Toraverlesungsszene (1 Esdr 9,37b.38 // Neh 7,72b; 8,1) dem Beginn der Altarbauszene nachgebaut wird (Esr 3,1), so erinnert das Ende der Mischehenliste (1 Esdr 9,37a) entfernt an das Ende der

Rückkehrerliste (1 Esdr 5,45 = Esr 2,70), ist aber eben im Unterschied zu Neh 7,72a keine Wiederholung von Esr 2,70, sondern der Abschluss einer völlig anderen Liste. T. (484) rekonstruiert für 1 Esdr 9,37a ganz zu Recht einen deutlich anderen Text als Neh 7,72a. Ich schließe mich, bis auf eine Einzelheit, ihrer Rekonstruktion an: T. weiß, dass in 1 Esdr οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ für אנשי אֱשֶׁר steht (27, 94), dennoch rekonstruiert sie וְיָמֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל für καὶ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ in 9,37a, wie sie es vom griechischen Text aus nie tun würde. Ihre "Rekonstruktion" lässt sich leiten von der schon vorhandenen These, 1 Esdr 9,37a sei "eigentlich" Neh 7,72a. Daher trägt sie aus Neh 7,72a וְיָמֵן ein. Jedenfalls stehen sich zwei deutlich verschiedene Texte gegenüber, deren einzige Gemeinsamkeit ist, dass sie Listen abschließen und die Gruppen in den Listen noch einmal aufführen. Die Listenschlüsse Neh 7,72a und Esr 2,70 sind wie die Listen Esr 2 und Neh 7 praktisch identisch. Dagegen ist 1 Esdr 9,37a mit 1 Esdr 5,45 nicht identisch (sowenig wie die zugehörigen Listen). 1 Esdr 9,37a lautet: "Und so wohnten (nach der nur in 1 Esdr hier erfolgten Ehescheidung) die Priester und die Leviten und die Männer Israels (also keine Heiden mehr) in Jerusalem und der Provinz". Dem entspricht die Vorlage: וַיֵּשְׁבוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם וְאֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּירוּשָׁלַם וּבמְדִינָה. Dagegen zählt der aus Esr 2 wiederholte Abschluss der Heimkehrerliste Neh 7,72a jene Gruppen noch einmal auf, die die Liste aufgeführt hatte: Priester, Leviten, Torwächter, Sänger, Laien und Tempelsklaven. Die illegitim Verheirateten waren in 1 Esdr 8,92 (Esr 10,5) als "Priester, Leviten und Israeliten" eingeführt worden. Und genau so fasst sie 1 Esdr 9,37a zusammen: "Priester, Leviten und Männer Israels". Dieser Listenschluss gehört zur in MT verstümmelten Mischehenliste. Er hat mit Neh 7,72a nichts zu tun. Nur die ersten drei Worte stimmen überein. Talshirs Entscheidung, zur Rekonstruktion der Vorlage von 1 Esdr 9,37a Neh 7,72a heranzuziehen, ist nicht in textkritischen Überlegungen begründet, sondern darin, dass sie logisch schon voraussetzt, 1 Esdr sei eine Kompilation, deren Autor Esr-Neh in der Textabfolge Esr 10 → Neh 1-7 → Neh 8 vorliegen gehabt habe. Dieser habe Neh 1-7 herausgeschnitten, dabei aber 7,72a stehen lassen. Das textkritische Postulat, 1 Esdr 9,37a sei Neh 7,72a, wäre nun tatsächlich notwendig, wenn es für diese literarkritische These irgendeinen Hinweis gäbe. Doch wo ist er? So führt eine argumentationslogisch vorgeordnete literarkritische Gesamtthese zu einer überraschenden textkritischen Entscheidung. Was ist aber die rechte logische Ordnung? Hier zeigt sich: Literarkritische Theoriebildungen sollten sich nach den Daten richten, nicht umgekehrt.

Dasselbe gilt für Talshirs Behandlung von Esr 4,21 und 1 Esdr 2,24. Der Brief des Artaxerxes soll in der Gesamtanlage von Esr-Neh den von den Heimkehrern begonnenen Wiederaufbau Jerusalems (Esr 4,12) unterbrechen, so dass die Stadt bis zur Ankunft Nehemias in Trümmern liegt (Neh 1,3; 2,3.13.17). In 1 Esdr hat der Brief des Artaxerxes eine andere Position in der Gesamtanlage; er weicht im Text (2,17 gegen Esr 4,12) und in der Funktion von Esr-Neh MT ab. Er unterbricht explizit nur den Tempelbau, nicht den Wiederaufbau der Stadt (1 Esdr 2,25: "So kam der Tempelbau zum Stillstand"). In 1 Esdr werden Nehemia und der Wiederaufbau Jerusalems durch ihn nicht erwartet. Die Stadt Jerusalem ist in 1 Esdr seit 2,17 bereits wieder aufgebaut (vgl. 1 Esdr 5,45; 6,8; 8,78 mit Esr 2,70; 5,8; 9,9). Tatsächlich fehlt ja die Nehemiaerzählung. Dagegen unterbricht in Esr MT

der Brief des Artaxerxes den Wiederaufbau Jerusalems bis zur Ankunft Nehemias. Und das drückt sich im Text so aus: "Diese Stadt soll nicht erbaut werden, bis von mir (dazu) das Dekret ergeht" (Esr 4,21). Dazu schreibt schon Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia*, 43: "zu der kategorischen Forderung 22 will es schlecht passen, dass 21bß die spätere Aufhebung des Bauverbots als möglich erscheinen lässt; man wird mit Kisters u.a. die Worte 'bis von mir Befehl gegeben wird', die 3 Esr nicht hat, als einen späteren Zusatz im Hinblick auf die dem Nehemia erteilte Erlaubnis [Neh 2,4ff] ansehen". Ebenso urteilen J. Bewer, *Der Text des Buches Esra* (FRLANT 14; Göttingen 1922) 55, K. Gallig, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra. Nehemia* (ATD 12; Göttingen 1954) 198, vgl. H.G.M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah*, 64, und J. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (OTL; London 1989) 115. Die Textdifferenz wird natürlich auch von T. wahrgenommen (120), aber ihre textkritische Erklärung wird bestimmt von der logisch vorgeordneten literarkritischen These, der Verfasser von 1 Esdr müsse die Verbindung von Esra- und Nehemiaerzählung gekannt und sekundär aufgelöst haben. Er könne daher an dieser Stelle keinen älteren Text, der Nehemia nicht erwartet, bieten. Das Fehlen von Esr 4,21bß in 1 Esdr 2,24 wird von T. daher künstlich als sekundär beurteilt: "These words may have been misunderstood as a simple duplication of the introductory phrase, and were therefore left out" (120). Aber kann "bis von mir der Befehl ergeht" am Ende des Satzes als Verdoppelung von "und nun gebt Befehl" (1 Esdr: "und nun befehle ich") am Anfang des Satzes missverstanden werden? Die Textkritik hängt hier von literarkritischen Vermutungen ab. Die besseren Erklärungen der genannten Autoren werden von T. weder erwähnt noch diskutiert.

Die hier erörterten, notwendigerweise fast mikroskopisch kleinen und doch folgenreichen Beispiele zeigen, dass T., bei aller hohen Kompetenz in vielen Normalfällen, an kritischen Stellen methodisch in ihren textkritischen Entscheidungen von einer bei ihr logisch vorausliegenden Hypothese über die Entstehungsgeschichte der behandelten Bücher abhängt. Dabei führt sie keine explizite wissenschaftliche Diskussion, an der man erkennen könnte, wo es problematisch wird. Im weithin unproblematischen Hauptbestand bleibt das Buch unentbehrlich. Doch muss man seine Schwachpunkte kennen. Das Problem besteht darin, dass Benutzer, die nicht tief in die Fragen der Textentstehung und -geschichte dieser Bücher verwickelt sind, sich schwer daran tun werden, zwischen dem vielen Guten und den problematischen Punkten zu unterscheiden.

Das Buch endet mit einer Bibliographie, einem Index von Textstellen und einer synoptischen Zusammenstellung der Kapitel und Verse von 1 Esdr mit den entsprechenden MT-Texten – alles sehr nützliche Dinge.

Offenbacher Landstraße 224  
D-60599 Frankfurt

Dieter BÖHLER

Rainer ALBERTZ, *Die Exilszeit*. 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (Biblische Enzyklopädie 7). Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2001. 344 p. 16 x 24. DM 44.60

This important new German project is making good progress. In the very short (11-12) introduction to the most recent addition to the series, Albertz treats briefly various topics. He places the exilic age from 587/6 to 520 B.C. The rest of the book, following the standard of the series, is divided into four parts.

The first part, *Das biblische Bild der Exilsepoche* (13-45), deals with different biblical conceptions of exile. Albertz refers to the irony that, since there is no coherent description of the exile in the Bible, the Bible itself has only a gap to offer for the period he is going to describe. What we do find are a few short descriptions of the beginning and the end of the exilic period, as well as some sporadic information. It remains a major question why the exile is not portrayed in a more comprehensive manner in the Bible. One might, perhaps, add another irony: Despite the shortage of sources, it is still, apparently, possible to write yet another 344 pages about the gap!

The remainder of part one presents texts that give information about views on exile in the Bible. Here, we find treatments of the exile as a lost opportunity for salvation (Jer 39-43), on the exile as the end of history (2 Kgs), and on the exile as Sabbath for the land (2 Chr). Also dealt with are pious stories like Dan 1-6, Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, the Page story (3 Ezra 3,1-5,6), the books of Tob and Jdt, and, finally, the relationship of the exile to apocalyptic views on history.

Part two, *Die Geschichte der Exilszeit* (46-116), treats specifically the history of the exilic period. Again, Albertz calls attention to the difficulty that the exilic period, similar to the pre-monarchic and the late Persian ones, suffers from a complete lack of sources, and must be regarded as a "dark age" in the history of ancient Israel. For this reason, Albertz stresses the importance of understanding the wider political system of which Judah formed a part in exilic times. Through the study of the larger historical frame, one may, indirectly, throw light also upon historical circumstances in Judah. Albertz then provides us with a short review of the history of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (626-539 B.C.). He discusses sources and rise to power. Particular weight is put on the height of the empire under Nebuchadnezzar's 43-year-long reign. Albertz ends his outline with a short survey of the decline and fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire.

Albertz treats the history of Israel during the exilic period in some detail. After having discussed, yet again, the difficult matter of sources, Albertz sets out to discuss the never-ending problem of how many deportations there were, as well as their dates. There were, according to Albertz, three different deportations. They may be dated, respectively, to the years 597 B.C., 587 B.C., and 582 B.C.

Yet another problem concerns the extent of the different deportations. As we know, such figures are notoriously difficult, if at all possible to estimate, and Albertz should be commended for entering into the debate at all. His discussion builds on the work of other scholars, above all Finkelstein. Albertz

estimates that the entire population of Judah at the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century B.C. was around 80,000. Between 600 and 520 B.C., Judah lost, according to Albertz, half its population. This implies that the population during the exilic period was around 40,000. Needless to say, there are many uncertainties here, as Albertz himself wisely admits (80).

Having dealt with the various conditions and backgrounds for exile, Albertz describes the history of Judah during the exile, as well as that of the Egyptian and Babylonian Golah. He further presents us with a survey of the early Persian period from Cyrus to Darius I, and of the history of Judah during the age of return from exile and the building of the Second Temple (538-520 B.C.). Albertz treats in some detail the problematic sources of Ezra 1-6 and the Books of Haggai and Zechariah, attempting to evaluate the historical information found in them.

Albertz ends his survey of the history of Judah during the exilic period with a short chapter on social change and its effect on religion (112-116). Here he is able to summarize his main views by stressing a few important points.

Among the important developments are the freeing of religion from the pre-exilic state system, followed by the scattering into various groups, as well as the liberation of the priestly classes from the kings' supervision.

Monotheism, according to Albertz, was introduced into Judah through the Second Isaian School and through the Deuteronomistic movement. However, it is still a matter of debate whether these literary works reflect monolatry rather than monotheism.

Furthermore, the loss of the territorial state represents more than the beginning of the exilic period. With Judeans living not only in Judah but also in Babylonia and Egypt we witness also the beginning of the Diaspora, with the growth of various local traits. Another important development was that the loss of the pre-exilic central government led to a strengthening of decentralized institutions like the family, the tribe, and the elders.

Moreover, the loss of national identity, and the transition to ethnic minority societies in Babylonia and Egypt, led to the strengthening of religious identity. Markers like circumcision, dietary rules, Shabbat, and family distinctiveness became very important. Finally, attitudes towards foreigners became more particularistic and exclusive. However, such attitudes were, according to Albertz, also mixed with positive views of the non-Jewish. It remains a question, though, whether, for instance, the words in Isa 44,5 and 55,5 should really be regarded as positive towards the nations.

The third part, *Die Literatur der Exilszeit* (117-323), constitutes the main part of Albertz's book. The literature of the exile, typically, reflects the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, the end of the Davidic dynasty, and the loss of the promised land. In the wake of these tragedies, however, there followed also an enormous blooming of theological literature. Albertz first deals with particular literary genres of the exilic period like the Public Lament and the City Lament. Both of these became much more important in exilic times and formed a regular part of the liturgy.

Another important development, according to Albertz, is that, following the fall of the state, the boundaries between the public and the private sphere were blurred. They led to the dissolution of psalm genres in general, resulting



in a mixture of public and private psalms. Albertz also discusses the role of salvation oracles, which he wants to dissociate a little from traditional form criticism. He points to parallels from ancient Near Eastern religions, and discusses dating problems.

Albertz further treats the oracles against the foreign nations, which, according to him, played an especially important role in the exilic period. He discusses their *Sitz im Leben*, which was originally to be found in war contexts. Later on, the genre was changed into foreign nation oracles. He also goes against those who hold that words against nations are not at the same time oracles of salvation for Israel. The last group of texts from the exilic period that are discussed are "sermons".

Having dealt with various genres or groups of texts, Albertz further presents us with the different literary works that he believes to have originated in exilic times. One such work is the Four Prophet Book. Consisting of the major parts of Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah, this work represented an early form of the Book of the Twelve. The Book of Habakkuk, according to Albertz, is another literary work of this period. Since it originated from a later period, however, it did not form a part of the Four Prophet Book.

Albertz further points to the fact that not only the prophets but also the historiographical works of ancient Israel were given new interpretations during the exilic period. Thus, he supports the existence of an exilic patriarchal history. He does point, however, to the problematic question of deciding which texts belong to this literary work. He admits, wisely, that the beginning of this work is not likely to be recovered since it has been completely rewritten by the priestly redaction of the Pentateuch. There were, according to Albertz, two different exilic patriarchal stories, and both of them were rewritten.

Another major literary work of the exilic period is the Deuteronomistic history. Albertz places this work not in Palestine (as does Martin Noth), but in Babylonia. Here, leading members of the royal and priestly families were responsible for the production of this important work. The Deuteronomistic history, according to Albertz, was written between 562 and 547 B.C. It is a little surprising to find references to exact years like this today. To the present reviewer, at least, such accurate dates can only be guesswork.

Yet another main work from the exilic period is the Book of Jeremiah. This work is, according to Albertz, heavily edited by the Deuteronomists (in two major revisions). Albertz claims, however, that, unlike that of the Deuteronomistic history, this rewriting took place in Judah, in the region of Mizpah, or Bethel. A final, third Deuteronomistic redaction represents the work in its present form.

The Book of Ezekiel, even though it was finished not much later than the Book of Jeremiah, had its origin in priestly/prophetic circles in Babylonia. In addition to the Four Prophet Book, the Deuteronomistic history, Jeremiah, and the priestly Ezekiel Book, the last literary work of the exilic period is Second Isaiah. This work of consolation is strongly influenced by the language of the Psalms. The Second Isaian corpus, too, has undergone two different literary editions.

The very short, fourth part (324-332) is called *Theologischer Ertrag*. In his survey of the theological outcome of the period, Albertz stresses above all

its richness. This was the time when so many of the central traits of Judaism and Christianity (monotheism, for instance) found new expressions.

Among the most important traits was the theological reflection of what went wrong with the Judean state. This further resulted in the creation of the kind of advanced history theology that we find in the Deuteronomistic history. This literary creation, moreover, represents the first historiographical work not only in ancient Israel, but in the world. Other important changes occurred above all in the royal and temple ideologies.

The author should be congratulated on this rich volume that contains a wealth of information. There are comprehensive, up-to-date bibliographies at the beginning of each new section. Despite the listing of a few works in English, the discussions are mainly based on German literature. Unfortunately, there is no index of modern authors, something which would have facilitated the use of the book as a reference tool.

University of Oslo  
P.O.Box 1023 Blindern  
N-0315 Oslo

Hans M. BARSTAD

### **Novum Testamentum**

Steven M. BRYAN, *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (SNTSMS 117). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. xv-278 p. 14 × 22. £45.00

In this doctoral dissertation Bryan (= B.) investigates how Jesus as eschatological prophet announced the national judgement of Israel and also promised Israel's restoration. Jesus must be understood within Palestinian Judaism. He reinterpreted Israel's Scripture and sacred traditions. In his message he both simply borrowed and radically modified traditional data regarding restoration. The introductory chapter situates the book in the history of research and explains the method that will be adopted. At the very outset of his work B. puts forward his moderate position: the reconstruction of the sayings and traditions of Jesus which can be taken as accurate "is that which accounts for the most material for which authenticity can be demonstrated and at the same time requires the rejection of the least amount of material for which authenticity cannot be demonstrated" (12). An excursus critically discusses N.T. Wright's opinion on Israel's enduring exile: bondage does not equal exile. Two chapters are then devoted to Jesus and national judgement. The following three discuss Jesus' vision of restoration. A brief final chapter offers the Conclusion.

Chapter two treats "Jesus and signs of national restoration". It is widely believed that Second Temple Jews expected miraculous phenomena that would indicate the obvious beginning of national eschatological restoration

according to the Exodus and Conquest tradition. The first-century "sign-prophets" provide the evidence of that popular expectation. Jesus flatly rejects such a sign (cf. Q 11,29-30). The only sign that will be given is that of Jonah, i.e., that of the Son of man. In most Jewish traditions Jonah does not announce a conditional judgement, but rather he proclaims judgement on the Ninevites. So also the Son of man confronts "this generation" with an approaching, irrevocable and unavoidable national punitive judgement. In chapter three ("Jesus and the Scripture of Israel") three particular motifs from the sacred traditions are examined: the vineyard, the eschatological banquet and the expression "this generation" (the last item in discussion with C. Tuckett). B. points out that Israel's restoration was commonly understood as an act of national forgiveness consequent upon judgement and repentance. The decimated vineyard will again be fruitful; restored Israel can expect a joyous eschatological banquet. Jesus alters these motifs. The vineyard parables announce an impending rejection of "this generation", an expression which points to the morally disqualified nation. The eschatological banquet will include sinners, but not the unrepentant so-called righteous of the nation. Jesus' message is similar to that of the prophets but at the same time different. "The national judgement proclaimed by Jesus was far more climactic and the impact on the meaning of Israel's election far more severe" (87). Israel's election is disrupted. "But, paradoxically, even as the proclamation of climactic judgement brought Israel's election to an end, it allowed Jesus to reassert the continuity of Israel's election: the pronouncement of Israel's judgement carried with it the announcement of a new act of election" (87). God's new eschatological act of election changed the shape of Israel by including even apostate but repentant individuals (and also Gentiles).

From chapter four ("Jesus and the restoration traditions of Israel") onward B. examines the positive expectation of Israel's restoration. Jesus did not intend the national reconstitution of the twelve tribes (although he chose and appointed the Twelve). A thorough analysis of Mk 9,11-13 is now provided. In Jewish traditions the returning Elijah is the forerunner of Yahweh; he will establish (more than prepare!) the restoration of Israel. Resurrection (cf. 9,9-10) is a constituent element of that restoration. In 9,13 Jesus says that Elijah has already come and restored all things. Thus Jesus considers that John, through his successful ministry, to a certain extent accomplished and completed that restoration: John created an eschatological remnant. "It would appear that Jesus viewed John as one who has called into existence a faithful remnant of those who have returned to the Lord. In this sense, the restoration is complete" (117). Therefore Jesus perceives his own role in connection with that existing penitent remnant, as it were, in the midst of an already realized eschatology. Jesus will add other people to it and bestow the blessings of the approaching kingdom on all participants. A discussion of Mk 4,11-12 explains Jesus' ministry of obduracy: "those outside" refer to the nation whose hardening Jesus promotes; "those who are addressed" represent individuals who constitute the purified remnant. In chapter five ("Jesus and the Purity of Israel") B. investigates Israel's sacred traditions of purity, Land and Temple. This first occurs in a lengthy in-depth discussion of Jewish purity texts, a discussion with J. Neusner and E.P.

Sanders. B. duly distinguishes not only between clean (pure) and unclean (impure, polluted) but also between holy and common; B. points to the different degrees in the purity requirements. Holiness cannot be dissociated from the Temple; holiness is consequent upon election. Jesus connects impure and evil with the activity of demons. "If the eschatological holiness of Israel was a motivation for the pursuit of extra purity in the present for many, there is at least some evidence that the holiness of the eschaton would generate a quite different conception of purity, one in which the question of physical impurity was irrelevant" (153). A number of sayings of Jesus, esp. Mk 7,1-5 and 7,15-23, are studied. Jesus asserts that bodily impurity posed no threat to holiness and emphasizes intentionality and purity of heart. The parable of the Good Samaritan must be explained in this purity context. The priest and the Levite visibly seek to preserve bodily purity; in fact by rejecting love of neighbor they become impure while the impure Samaritan is approved by God; this Samaritan manifests the purity of the eschatological order. In chapter six ("Jesus and the eschatological Temple") various and even contrasting Jewish traditions about the eschatological Temple are examined, with special attention to welcoming Gentiles into the holy place or excluding them. The Temple action of Mk 11,15-17 is thoroughly analyzed. This action was not so much a cleansing of defilement nor an abolition of its expiatory purpose (i.e., a repudiation of the cult), it above all indicates that the standing Jerusalem Temple was no longer an efficacious expression of Israel's election. The Second Temple fails to manifest the conditions of the eschaton. The morally culpable fruitlessness of the nation is condemned, as well as its unbelief in Jesus' message of eschatological fulfilment. Such texts as Mk 11,12-14 (the barren fig tree), Mt 17,24-27 (the Temple tax) and Mk 14,48 (a temple not made with hands) find an appropriate explanation within Jesus' view of the physical Temple and its non-material eschatological counterpart.

In chapter seven ("Conclusion") a compact yet readable and clear summary of the results is presented, as well as a brief reflection on the implications for the study of the historical Jesus. This last paragraph shows how Jesus, according to B., can still be positioned within Judaism notwithstanding his critical use of its sacred traditions and how Jesus is related to early Christianity.

Hardly enough praise can be given to B.'s work: its careful detailed overview of Jewish traditions and their interpretations, as well as the tight logic and reasoning that span the whole defense of his main thesis: Jesus' paradoxical message is "that Israel's sacred traditions concerning national judgement and national restoration were coming to simultaneous rather than sequential fulfilment" (217). B. requires utmost attention from his readers. To mention just two examples of exemplary exegesis out of many: one admires the fine, insightful treatments of Mk 12,1-9 (the parable of the vineyard, 52-56, and the introductory remarks, 46-52) and Mk 11,15-17 (the Temple action, 206-225).

However, most readers, I fear, will regard several sections of the book as extremely hypothetical. The correctness of B.'s view of Jesus' realized eschatology depends on the question whether the so-called national judgement was a definitive condemnation of Israel. This can hardly be the case; the indictment remains conditional. What exactly does it mean that the

nation as such is judged? B. puts the national judgement over against Jesus' openness towards and acceptance of sinners in a somewhat forced manner. The forgiveness of the individual sinner, however, supposes his or her repentance and requires the consequent renewal of life. Furthermore, few readers will accept B.'s claim that Jesus and his listeners regarded the preaching of Jonah to the Ninevites as an unconditional condemnation; it would seem that the gospel texts speak against such an understanding. Many readers will hardly agree with the contention that the Baptist's ministry was on the whole successful and that Jesus considered John's followers as the eschatological remnant. B.'s exegesis of Mk 9,9-13 is very strained indeed (see 107-112). Some readers will find the whole discussion on the purity traditions (and of those on the expectation of an eschatological Temple) perhaps overly sophisticated; they may ask whether one can determine Jesus' critical use of them in such an outspoken way.

The oppositional data that B. discusses, such as Israel and Gentiles, continuity and discontinuity, realized eschatology and future longings, are notoriously difficult to define in their exact relatedness. Equally difficult are a number of New Testament passages which B. examines. The learning and acuteness of the overall treatment highly commends this monograph. Not without justification the author more than once repeats the clause "what has not received due attention".

Waversebaan 220  
B-3001 Heverlee (Leuven)

Jan LAMBRECHT

Craig R. KOESTER, *Hebrews*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Bible, volume 36, Doubleday, New York 2001, XXIV & 604 pp.

Professeur d'exégèse néotestamentaire au séminaire luthérien de Saint Paul (Minnesota), Craig R. Koester nous offre un commentaire de la Lettre aux Hébreux remarquable sous de nombreux rapports.

Mentionnons d'abord son impressionnante érudition, qui se manifeste continuellement. Longue de 34 pages, la Bibliographie s'étend du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle aux dernières années du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle et présente des études écrites en de nombreuses langues (latin, anglais, allemand, français, espagnol, italien). Les ouvrages cités reparaissent souvent dans les notes et dans le commentaire à propos de tel ou tel passage précis. Beaucoup d'autres ouvrages y apparaissent, car la bibliographie est volontairement incomplète; elle ne comprend pas les nombreux auteurs de l'antiquité mis à contribution, qu'il s'agisse d'auteurs juifs comme Philon et Josèphe, d'auteurs et d'écrits grecs et latins, en particulier les traités de rhétorique ancienne, et d'auteurs et d'écrits des premiers siècles chrétiens, comme la Lettre de Clément, le Pasteur d'Hermas etc. Le premier chapitre de l'Introduction, intitulé "History of Interpretation and Influence", offre de ce point de vue une riche moisson.

Le second chapitre, "Social Setting", est remarquable, lui aussi, car il

montre un intérêt pour la sociologie. Effectivement, le commentaire ne se limite pas à des analyses sémantiques et littéraires approfondies, mais cherche à préciser la situation de la communauté chrétienne dans son entourage païen et les problèmes qui en résultaient. Koester annonce dès sa préface qu'il s'attachera moins à situer Hébreux par rapport à des événements datables, comme la destruction du Temple de Jérusalem, qu'à préciser l'histoire interne de la communauté (XIII). Dans cette histoire, il distingue trois phases successives, qu'on peut discerner dans les allusions faites par l'auteur: une phase d'évangélisation et de conversion, puis une phase de persécution, vécue dans la solidarité, enfin une phase de tensions et de malaise (64-76). L'analyse précise de ces phases donne du relief au commentaire.

Autre aspect remarquable, annoncé par le 3<sup>e</sup> chapitre de l'Introduction, l'attention donnée aux aspects "formels et rhétoriques". Sur le genre rhétorique d'Hébreux, K. prend une position originale et digne d'attention, qui est aussi celle de David A. de Silva dans *Perseverance in Gratitude*, paru en 2000. Il note que le genre varie en fonction de la situation de conscience des auditeurs. Aux chrétiens qui sont fermes dans la foi, le texte se présente comme "épideictique", car il leur montre les richesses du mystère du Christ. Par contre, aux chrétiens indécis et branlants, le texte se présente comme "délibératif", car il "cherche à les dissuader de l'apostasie et à les pousser à un plus clair engagement de foi" (82). Intéressante, également, est la réflexion sur les trois moyens de convaincre indiqués par Aristote (*logos*, *pathos*, *ēthos*). K. observe que, pour donner autorité à sa prédication, l'auteur d'Hébreux ne met pas en avant ses mérites personnels, mais compte sur l'autorité de Dieu lui-même et de sa parole (91).

Le 4<sup>e</sup> et dernier chapitre de l'Introduction présente brièvement un choix de thèmes théologiques traités dans Hébreux: cosmologie et eschatologie, christologie, promesses, alliances et Loi, les Écritures, action divine et réponse humaine.

L'attention accordée aux aspects rhétoriques d'Hébreux suscite beaucoup d'observations de détail qui sont éclairantes et aident à comprendre la stratégie oratoire de l'auteur, visant à provoquer chez ses auditeurs telle ou telle réaction, en tenant compte de leur situation sociologique et spirituelle.

La composition du texte est examinée attentivement. Dans certaines cas, cependant, la traduction ne la respecte pas. L'ordre de la phrase initiale (1,1-4), par exemple, est bouleversé: les affirmations centrales, au participe présent, sur l'être du Fils et sur son pouvoir par rapport à l'univers, sont transportées après le rappel, à l'aoriste, des deux phases de son mystère pascal, purification des péchés et session à droite de Dieu (176). Ce changement modifie radicalement la perspective. Les affirmations centrales perdent leur caractère absolu et sont réduites à un rôle secondaire, d'illustration de la glorification du Christ. Dans la traduction, le verbe "être" disparaît; au lieu du participe "étant", placé aussitôt après le relatif (*hos ōn*) et donc en grand relief, on trouve une simple conjonction «comme» ("*as*" en anglais), qui se fond dans la phrase.

La traduction de la phrase centrale de tout le sermon (9,11-12) suscite une remarque semblable. Ici aussi, l'ordre est bouleversé, ce qui provoque un changement considérable dans les rapports entre les divers éléments de la phrase et donc dans la signification de celle-ci. En grec, la phrase contient la

succession: “Christ... *par la tente*... entra une fois pour toutes *dans le sanctuaire*, ayant trouvé une éternelle rédemption”. Il est clair que les expressions “par la tente” et “*dans le sanctuaire*” sont corrélatives; “la tente” est la voie parcourue pour entrer “dans le sanctuaire”. K. sépare ces deux expressions; il laisse la seconde avec le verbe “entrer”, mais rapporte la première au verbe “trouver”: “Christ... entered once for all into the sanctuary, securing an eternal redemption through the... tent...” (406). Après quoi, K. confond “la tente” et “le sanctuaire”, en disant que «l’arrivée du Christ comme grand prêtre *dans* “la tente plus grande et plus parfaite” (c’est moi qui souligne “*dans*”) marque un sommet dans la partie centrale d’Hébreux» (411). Plus loin, il affirme que cette tente “est le *but* (c’est moi qui souligne) du pèlerinage de foi des auditeurs” (413). Confondre le chemin et le but n’est pas une erreur de faible importance, surtout quand il s’agit du mystère du Christ. Hébreux ne dit jamais que le Christ est entré *dans* la tente.

Pour l’ensemble de la composition du sermon, l’analyse rhétorique a pris, à mon avis, un mauvais point de départ. Dans l’analyse rhétorique d’un texte oratoire, l’élément le plus important est évidemment l’identification de la *propositio*, c’est-à-dire du passage où l’orateur indique le sujet qu’il veut traiter, la thèse qu’il veut défendre. La place normale de la *propositio* se trouve à la fin de l’exorde ou de la *narratio*. K. estime que l’exorde d’Hébreux ne consiste pas simplement dans la longue période initiale (1,1-4), mais s’étend jusqu’à 2,4. Il situe alors la *propositio* en 2,5-9; ce texte commence par une déclaration négative au sujet des anges (“Ce n’est pas à des anges, en effet, que Dieu a soumis le monde futur”); il continue en citant un passage du Ps 8 sur le dessein de Dieu pour l’homme (abaissé au dessous des anges, l’homme a néanmoins été glorifié et placé au dessus de tout) et il se termine par une double constatation: la domination décidée n’est pas encore effective, mais, en Jésus, les phases d’abaissement et de glorification se sont accomplies. Ce texte ne manque donc pas de substance. Selon K. il exprime le sujet du sermon. En conséquence, l’interprétation de toute la Lettre est faite en fonction de cette *propositio*. Étant une présentation du mystère du Christ, celle-ci permet de rendre compte d’une grande partie de la Lettre, mais elle a en même temps un effet surprenant: comme elle ne dit rien du sacerdoce du Christ, elle conduit l’exégète à résumer toute la Lettre sans faire la moindre mention d’un sacerdoce (84-85). Selon ce résumé, après la *propositio* de 2,5-9, le texte présente 3 démonstrations :

1) “Jésus a reçu la gloire par sa fidélité dans la souffrance — un chemin que d’autres sont appelés à suivre (2,10–5,10)”.

2) “La souffrance de Jésus est le sacrifice qui donne à d’autres la capacité de s’approcher de Dieu (7,1–10,25)”.

3) “Le peuple de Dieu persévère à travers la souffrance vers la gloire par la foi (11,1–12,24)”.

On le voit, aucune de ces trois phrases ne donne à Jésus le titre de “prêtre” ou de “grand prêtre”, qui lui est attribué avec insistance dans Hébreux (*hiereus*: 5,6; 7,17.21; 10,21; *archiereus*: 2,17; 3,1; 4,14.15; 5,5.10; 6,20; 7,26; 8,1; 9,11). Cette constatation amène à se demander si 2,5-9 est réellement la *propositio* qui exprime le thème du sermon. Un examen objectif des données littéraires fait conclure que non. Ce passage, en effet, fait partie du développement qui compare la position du Christ à celle des anges,

comparaison annoncée à la fin de la phrase initiale (1,4), commencée aussitôt après (1,5-6) et poursuivie jusqu'en 2,16. Le texte du Ps 8 a été choisi par l'auteur parce qu'il parle d'un rapport avec les anges. Ceux-ci sont nommés 3 fois en He 2,5-9: d'abord pour introduire la citation (2,5), ensuite dans la citation (2,7), enfin dans le commentaire du texte cité (2,9). Il n'y a donc pas lieu de séparer 2,5-9 du contexte précédent pour en faire la *propositio* du sermon. Si 2,5-9 avait ce rôle, le rapport du Christ avec les anges devrait être présent dans tout le reste du sermon, de même que le thème de la "soumission" de toutes choses, mais en réalité, après 2,16, les anges disparaissent de la scène; on ne les retrouve que tout à la fin et sans rapport avec le Christ (12,22; 13,2); quant au thème de la soumission, 5 fois présent en 2,5-9, on ne le retrouve qu'en 12,9 où il est, lui aussi, sans rapport avec le Christ.

La façon dont est résumée la 1<sup>e</sup> démonstration (2,10-5,10; voir ci-dessus) est difficilement justifiable, car 2,10-18, qui parle de souffrance, ne parle pas de gloire pour Jésus et 3,1-6, qui parle de gloire, n'évoque aucunement la souffrance. Le thème de la souffrance est absent de 3,1 à 4,14.

D'autre part, K. minimise l'importance de la division très nette du texte en 3,1. Observant que le *othen* initial se trouve ailleurs "au milieu d'un argument plutôt qu'au début d'une section" (224 et 242), il veut ne voir en 3,1 que le début d'un paragraphe, la division principale étant mise en 2,10. Mais 3,1 ne commence pas simplement par un *othen*, comme les autres passages allégués. En 3,1 *othen* est immédiatement suivi de la première interpellation adressée par l'auteur à son auditoire et cette interpellation est aussi la plus solennelle: "frères saints, participants d'une vocation céleste, considérez...". Nulle part ailleurs dans le texte d'Hébreux, on ne trouve une telle insistance. Et que doivent considérer les auditeurs? — Le thème du sacerdoce du Christ, qui vient d'être introduit en 2,17, après avoir été habilement préparé dans l'exorde (1,1-4) et dans une sorte de *narratio* (1,5-2,16). Une analyse rhétorique précise amène donc à situer la *propositio* non pas en 2,5-9 mais en 2,17-18 et à reconnaître que le thème principal du sermon est le sacerdoce du Christ. Après un premier développement sur ce thème (3,1-5,10), la *propositio* est reprise et complétée en 5,9-10, phrase qui annonce le grand exposé central sur le même thème (7,1-10,18).

Pour l'interprétation d'un texte oratoire, le discernement de la *propositio* (et des éventuelles *sub-propositiones*) est assurément important, mais il convient de remarquer qu'une erreur à ce sujet n'invalide pas forcément le commentaire détaillé du texte. Parce qu'il a choisi He 2,5-9 comme *propositio*, le Prof. Koester a donné d'Hébreux une présentation défectueuse, divisée en trois démonstrations dont les thèmes ne mentionnent pas le sacerdoce du Christ. Mais ce fait ne l'a pas empêché de fournir un commentaire approfondi de toute la Lettre, y compris des passages qui traitent du Christ grand prêtre.

Une riche documentation et l'attention accordée à la situation des auditeurs, aux préoccupations de l'auteur et aux procédés oratoires utilisés par celui-ci font que ce commentaire jette souvent une lumière nouvelle sur le texte de la Lettre aux Hébreux.



## Varia

Jaime VÁZQUEZ ALLEGUE, *Los Hijos de la Luz y los Hijos de las Tinieblas*. El prólogo de la Regla de la Comunidad de Qumrán (Biblioteca Midrásica 21). Estella, Verbo Divino, 2000. 433 p. 16 × 23,5.

This book, based on a dissertation presented to the University of Salamanca in 1999, is an extremely thorough analysis of 1Q 1,1-15, the prologue to the Rule of the Community. The first part of the book is dedicated to a brief history of research and a general presentation of the religious life of the community. For its history, Vázquez accepts the Groningen hypothesis. Regarding the literary development of the rule, he in general accepts the four stages which have been proposed by J. Murphy O'Connor, J. Pouilly, F. García Martínez and most recently by Ph. Alexander who could already include all fragments of 4Q in his analysis. The second part which is the essential contribution of the book, consists of a palaeographical study, mainly the reconstruction of the lacunae in the first lines, and an exegetical study of the text. A short third part offers a theological study of the text. An extensive bibliography and indices conclude the book.

I turn first to the central part of the book, the establishment of the text and its exegesis. Vázquez takes much care and proceeds slowly, step by step, to fill the lacunae of the first two lines. After determining how many letters and spaces fit the lacunae, he considers all possible phrases of 1QS and its parallels in 4Q which begin or end with the same words as those encountered in the readable parts of the prologue. In his results, V. agrees in the main lines with most authors who preceded him; new, at least in part, is the reconstruction of the first lacuna in line 1 which he reads לְמַשְׁכִּיל לְלֹמֵד כָּל אֲנָשִׁים and translates: "P[ara el Instructor para enseñar a todos los hom]bres". This reconstruction may not add much to our understanding of the text, but it is very well argued and convincing. The remaining text of the prologue is analyzed with the same thoroughness, but arrives at the same reading of the text as has been established in the standard publications.

Having arrived at the correct reading of the text and a preliminary translation, V. proceeds with its linguistic analysis down to the smallest details. His approach seems very meticulous; the readers he has in mind are obviously very beginners with only the most basic knowledge of Hebrew. He states, for example, that the accusative particle *et* normally is not translated, and explains every preposition, every infinitive of the most common verbs, indicates construct forms (not always) and refers for every word to the standard dictionaries. As to parallel texts which he frequently quotes, his translations are in general far less literal, sometimes only approximations.

In spite of this extreme attention to the smallest details, some linguistic remarks are astonishing. The phrase עֵינֵי זֶמֶר in 1QS 1,6 is an extreme example (130). At first, עֵינֵי is correctly explained as a dual form in the construct state, but then V. continues: "Al final encontramos el sufijo de tercera persona del

singular, que indica posesión y que traducimos como ‘y sus ojos’. La línea finaliza con el término זונה, participio femenino plural, del verbo זנה ‘fornicar, deshonorar’. Neither he nor anybody else reads here עיניו, which could somehow justify his analysis. In the last part of the book (341), the phrase is correctly explained, זונה understood as a noun depending on the construct noun which precedes. Another example is the analysis of צדקו in 1,13: “compuesto por el adjetivo צדק, seguido por el sufijo de tercera persona” (161). In 1,14 בקציהם is derived from the noun קצה instead of the common form קץ (164). Very strange is the quotation of אל נקמה in 1Q 4,12 (152-153), translated as “el Dios de la venganza”. All biblical references for נקמה (153, n. 279) are the first part of a construct form. The quotation of 4,12 neglects the context; in full, the text reads באף עברת אל נקמה; the last word would have to be read as נוקמה, as vocalized by E. Lohse (*Die Texte aus Qumran hebräisch und deutsch*, München 1964), or corrected to נקמה, as e.g. by C. Martone (*La “Regola della Comunità”*, Edizione Critica, Torino 1995) and in the text edited by J.H. Charlesworth (*The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. I, Tübingen 1994) who comments on this verse: “Originally נוקמה; then erasure of ו and curve of the left leg of ה to form ה”. The explanation of the plene writing of several words where waw is used as vowel letter (e.g. the spelling חוק or כוח instead of biblical חק or כח) as archaic forms is also somewhat strange. But apart from such oddities the philological analysis succeeds as a good guide for the beginner, sometimes also as justification of the translation and understanding of the text.

A real contribution of this book is the structural analysis of the text and its repetitive use of phonetic signals to give this introduction to the rule a solemn rhythm and poetic quality and to help its memorization. This structure comes out very well in the graphic presentation of the Hebrew text (188). The division of the text into title, six sections, and epilogue is well justified.

The second chapter of this part of the book is an “estudio exegetico” of 1QS 1,1-15. The “exégesis” analyzes every single term and phrase of these lines, normally giving the basic meaning of the terms, mainly a selection of fully quoted texts in which the terms occur in the Bible, in Qumran and in the New Testament. Here I find hardly anything really new; the enumeration of biblical and New Testament passages where the word “book” occurs, could have been omitted without loss. For a number of terms V. could have given a more extended discussion, as e.g. for ברית, which he sees to be employed in the same meaning in the Bible and Qumran without noting any development or special emphasis in Qumran. As to עצת אל (1,8.10) V. assumes it to be the highest legislative council in the community: “El consejo de Dios en Qumrán estaba formado por hombres – miembros de la comunidad” (266). The possibility of understanding the phrase as “God’s counsel” is not even considered. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (ed. F. García Martínez – E.J.C. Tigchelaar, I, Leiden 1997), the same phrase is translated in 1,8 “in the counsel of God”, in 1,10 “in God’s plan”; C. Martone, translates the term both times as “consiglio”, but adds: “con questo termine abbiamo cercato di rendere il duplice significato del termine ebraico... su cui anche il nostro testo gioca... risulta essere sia il ‘piano di Dio’, sia ‘l’assemblea di Dio’, quindi la setta stessa di Qumran” (*Regola*, 138, n. 12). I should have liked to see a more

extended discussion including all possibilities of understanding this phrase in context. As a matter of fact, the theme recurs in the last part of the book (349-351), but here V. seems to contradict his earlier statement: Here the “consejo de Dios” is understood as “obediencia divina” in contrast with the “consejo justo... como ‘obediencia humana’” (351).

Let us turn now to the description of the religious life of the community of Qumran and its antecedents in the first part of the book which may be read together with the theological analysis of the third part. A rather uncritical survey presents quite different groups of the biblical and Second Temple periods which V. considers in some way as forerunners of the religious life of Qumran and also of the later Christian religious orders. Some of the parallels which he offers are highly problematic: Can one really speak of a community of Nazirites in the period of the Judges 1200-1100 B.C.E (48) or compare the Levites with lay brothers in Christian orders (48-49)? How can V. support his claim of a “vida ciertamente comunitaria entre ellos mismos” of the priests who “se reunían para orar” (50)? Equally problematic is the statement regarding the Sanhedrin which is said to have served as the supreme court of 71 members who controlled the whole religious life of the people and were aided by small courts of three or four members all over the country. There is no evidence that they led some form of common religious life; in reality the very existence of the Sanhedrin as a permanent institution is a matter of heated controversy in recent research. Another religious community V. mentions, are the “scribes” who after long years of formation were ordained at the age of 40 and were distinguished from the common people by a special dress (50-51): Here again V. would have difficulties in documenting his claims; the same holds true of the Zelots who according to V. lived in small groups, separated from the people, sometimes in caves, and adopted a life of poverty. Here again no historical differentiation is considered. Not surprisingly the Hasidim also form part of this survey. Most of this discussion (46-52) is rather irrelevant to the main topic of the book and full of problems. The direct comparison of the Essenes, especially the group of Qumran, and the later Christian monks (52-54) draws some obvious parallels, but equates too easily the Qumranic practice of having all property in common with the Christian vow of poverty; the “celibate life” of the community would need some contrastive analysis instead of simply claiming the parallel with the Christian ideal.

The theological study of the prologue which is offered in the third part of the book, deals with four central topics, every one merely in rough outlines; in reality all of them would deserve a book of their own, as V. rightly observes. The first topic is “To seek God”. This chapter offers a good sketch of a central theme of Qumranic spirituality. What strikes one as odd, is the constant insistence on the “vision of God, visio Dei” as the ultimate goal of this search in Qumran, without giving any concrete text where this goal is expressed. Since the *visio Dei* is not part of the common mystic tradition in Judaism, it would be all the more important to support such a claim for Qumran. As far as I am aware, the only text one might quote, would be 4Q160 1,5 (Vision of Samuel), where Eli asks Samuel to let him know “the vision of God” (מראה האלהים). But Samuel’s dream-experience has nothing to do with a *visio Dei* which the members of the Qumran community are said to strive

for. Here again the temptation to read the Qumran texts in a Christian key, has not been fully avoided.

Qumran dualism is the second topic. The term is taken in a rather imprecise way so that it can be applied even to the idea of two messiahs in Qumran (314) or a number of opposite word pairs. The Qumran dualism is explained with its apocalyptic world view, without further discussion or differentiation. The third theological topic to be discussed is the calendar of Qumran, again connected (exclusively) with the apocalyptic-messianic thought of Qumran. Most of the first part of this chapter is not concerned with the calendar as such, but with the more general idea of fulfilling God's commandments. In the second part of the chapter V. speaks of the apocalyptic current at Qumran, using the terms apocalyptic and eschatology as interchangeable. Only then V. does return to the liturgical calendar: "El tema del calendario en Qumrán es, en realidad, una cuestión de liturgia" (335). Was it really only, or even primarily, a liturgical problem? V. always takes for granted that the people of Qumran opposed changes in the traditional calendar; the possibility that they themselves were responsible for such changes is never even mentioned. But then V. sways off again to speak extensively of the (intellectual) purification because of 1,12 לברר דעתם which he translates: "para purificar sus conocimientos". He regards the verb as a synonym of סדר (3,5); the penal code of Qumran is discussed in the context of purification and ritual baths. The whole topic of purity seems to be much more important than that of the calendar which soon disappears. V. sees the topic of purity, which in general he outlines very well, in the context of the liturgy and thus connected with the calendar; purity, however, is a constant and permanent demand and thus certainly is hardly connected with the calendar! V. might have better chosen another title for this section. "The community" is the last theological topic to be discussed. The concept of community and the common life of the group, its organization, rules of admission and the common property of the members are the main themes which V. summarizes; most of it has already been stated in earlier parts of the book, but is here well drawn together.

As all volumes in the series *Biblioteca Midrásica*, this volume is of high aesthetic quality. But much more careful proof-reading was needed. Where Hebrew text is inserted in the Spanish text and extends over more than a line, very frequently (in the second half of the book nearly always) the word order is incorrect. The problem is well known and should have deserved more attention. A line seems to have fallen out at the end of 68; I have also some problems with the paragraph 83-84. The whole book is very repetitive; 279, n. 188 is literally repeated in 280, n. 191. Once an English title of W. Brownlee is quoted, but the text is given in French (104, n. 73); Lohse's translation is once called "English" (154, n. 304). J. Maier's translation of the Qumran texts is always quoted as Maier-Schubert; in reality, Maier was the sole author of the translation, K. Schubert contributed the historical part of the book.

Such very minor details should not, however, detract from the merits of the book. Reviewers tend to concentrate on aspects of the book with which they do not agree — in this case the tendency of the author to read the text from Qumran too much from a Christian point of view and to be very

uncritical in most topics which are not central to his main study. The grammatical analysis will be of great use mainly for students working for the first time with a text from Qumran. But the main value of the book lies in the extremely careful analysis of this short text which serves as an introduction to the spirituality of Qumran as a whole. For a first book, this is a major achievement.

Institut für Judaistik der Universität Wien  
Spitalgasse 2 Hof 7  
A-1090 Wien

Günter STEMBERGER

# NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

**Colloquium Biblicum**  
**at the Catholic University of Louvain**  
April 15 – 17, 2004

The 2<sup>nd</sup> international colloquium of the  
*Réseau de recherche en analyse narrative des textes bibliques*  
(RRENAB)  
«La Bible en récits, II»  
will be held on 15 – 17 April 2004  
at the Catholic University of Louvain (Louvain-la-Neuve – Belgium).

For informations and propositions of offered papers, please contact:

Prof. André Wénin – Faculté de théologie  
Grand-Place 45  
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve  
Fax: ++ 32 10 47 48 40  
E-mail: [wenin@exeg.ucl.ac.be](mailto:wenin@exeg.ucl.ac.be)

## LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Books sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Books, articles and offprints from periodicals sent to *Biblica* will be made available to the editor of the *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

**Nave, Guy D., Jr.**, *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts* (Academia Biblica 4). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. viii-241 p. 15 × 23. \$32.95

**Neagoe, Alexandru**, *The Trial of the Gospel. An Apologetic Reading of Luke's Trial Narratives* (SNTSMS 116). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. xv-253 p. 14 × 22

**Nwachukwu, Mary Sylvia**, *Creation-Covenant Scheme and Justification by Faith. A Canonical Study of the God-Human Drama in the Pentateuch and the Letter to the Romans* (Tesi gregoriana, serie teologia 89). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2002. 372 p. 17 × 24. €22,00 – \$23.00

**O'Kane, Martin** (ed.), *Borders, Boundaries and the Bible* (JSOTSS 313). London, Sheffield Academic Press Ltd, 2002. xii-358 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

**Paganini, Simone**, *Der Weg zur Frau Zion, Ziel unserer Hoffnung. Aufbau, Kontext, Sprache, Kommunikationsstruktur und theologische Motive in Jes 55, 1-13* (SBB 49). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002. 232 p. 14,5 × 20,5. €40,90

**Pardee, Dennis**, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit* (Writings from the Ancient World 10). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. xiii-299 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**Pasquale, Gianluigi**, *La storia della salvezza. Dio Signore del tempo e della storia* (Diaconia alla verità 11). Milano, Paoline Editoriale Libri, 2002. 178 p. 12 × 21. €10,50

**Pasquetto, Virgilio**, *Chiamati a vita nuova. Temi di spiritualità biblica. Volume I: Antico testamento; Volume II: Nuovo testamento*. Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2002. 277 p. (Vol. I), 375 p. (Vol. II). 17 × 24. €17,00 (Vol. I); €21,50 (Vol. II)

**Pentti, Eugen J.**, *Long-Suffering Love. A Commentary on Hosea with Patristic Annotations*. Brookline, Massachusetts, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2002. xiii-221 p. 15 × 23. \$15.95

**Person, Raymond F., Jr.**, *The Deuteronomic School. History, Social*

Setting, and Literature (Studies in Biblical Literature 2). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. x-175 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

**Pesch**, Rudolf, *La primauté dans l'Église*. Les fondements bibliques (Lire la Bible 125). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002. 172 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €17,00

**Philips Long**, V. – **Baker**, David W. – **Wenham**, Gordon J. (eds.), *Windows into Old Testament History*. Evidence, Argument, and the Crisis of "Biblical Israel". Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. viii-204 p. 16 × 23,5. \$22.00 – £15.99

**Pikor**, Wojciech, *La comunicazione profetica alla luce di Ez 2-3* (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia 88). Roma, Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2002. 316 p. 17 × 24. €20,00 – \$21.00

**Pisano**, Ombretta, *La radice e la stirpe di Davide*. Salmi davidici nel libro dell'Apocalisse (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 85). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2002. 487 p. 17 × 24. €27,00 – \$27.00

**Poffet**, Jean-Michel, O.P. (sous la direction de), *L'autorité de l'Écriture* (LD hors série). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002. 302 p. 13,5 × 21,5. €28

**Prickett**, Stephen, *Narrative, Religion and Science*. Fundamentalism versus Irony, 1700-1999. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. viii-281 p. 15 × 23. Cloth: £45.00 – \$65.00; paper: £15.95 – \$23.00

**Reif**, Stefan (ed.), *The Cambridge Genizah Collections: Their Contents and Significance* (Cambridge University Library Genizah Series 1). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. xiv-241 p. 20 × 30. £45.00 – \$60.00

**Rofé**, Alexander, *Deuteronomy*, Issues and Interpretation. London – New York, T & T Clark, 2002. xiii-258 p. 14 × 22. £30.00

**Samuelson**, Norbert M., *Revelation and the God of Israel*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. x-259 p. 15,5 × 23,5. £45.00

**Sandnes**, Karl Olav, *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles* (SNTSMS 120). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. xiv-318 p. 14 × 22. £45.00 – \$60.00

**Schmid**, Hansjörg, *Gegner im 1. Johannesbrief ? Zu Konstruktion und Selbstreferenz im johanneischen Sinnsystem* (BWANT 159). Stuttgart, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 2002. 335 p. 16 × 24. €35,00 – SFr 57,80

**Schnabel**, Eckhard J., *Urchristliche Mission*. Wuppertal, R. Brockhaus Verlag, 2002. xxxii-1806 p. 15 × 21,5

**Schnackenburg**, Rudolf, *The Gospel of Matthew*. Translated by Robert R. Barr. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. vii-329 p. 16 × 23. \$24.00 – £17.99

**Scott**, James M., *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*. The Book of Jubilees (SNTSMS 113). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. viii-337 p. 14,5 × 25,5. £45.00 – \$60.00

**Secondin**, Bruno, *La lettura orante della Parola*. «Lectio divina» in comunità e in parrocchia, Volume 2. Padova, Edizioni Messaggero, 2002. 367 p. 13 × 21. €20,00

**Sherwood**, Stephen K., C.M.F., *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2002. xviii-306 p. 16 × 23,5. \$39.95

**Simian-Yofre**, Horacio, *Amos*. Nuova versione, introduzione e com-



mento (I libri biblici, Primo Testamento 15). Milano, Paoline, 2002. 242 p. 15,5 × 23,5. €23,00 – Lit. 44.534

**Smith**, David E., *The Canonical Function of Acts*. A Comparative Analysis. Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2002. 136 p. 15 × 23. \$15,95

**Smith**, Mark S., *The Early History of God*. Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2002. xlv+243 p. 16 × 23,5. \$25,00 – £17,99

**Swanson**, Reuben J. (ed.), *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*. Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus. Romans. Wheaton, Illinois, Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. – Pasadena, California, William Carey International University Press, 2001. xxxix+391 p. 18 × 21,5

**Talbot**, Michel, «*Heureux les doux, car ils hériteront la terre (Mt 5,4 [5])*» (EB 46). Paris, J. Gabalda et C<sup>e</sup>, Éditeurs, 2002. 454 p. 16 × 24. €62,00

**Thomas**, David (edited and translated by), *Early Muslim Polemic against Christianity*. Abû 'Îsâ al-Warrâq's "Against the Incarnation" (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 59). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002. x+314 p. 16 × 23,5. £45,00 – \$65,00

**Tremblay**, P. Hervé, *Job 19,25-27 dans la Septante et chez les Pères grecs*. Unanimité d'une tradition (EB 47). Paris, J. Gabalda et C<sup>e</sup>, Éditeurs, 2002. 571 p. 16 × 24. €75

**Trevijano Etcheverría**, Ramón, *Estudios Paulinos* (Plenitudo Temporis 8). Salamanca, Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2002. 642 p. 17 × 24. €26,87

**Turner**, John D., *Sethian Gnosticism and the Platonic Tradition* (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, section «Études» 6). Québec, Les Presses de l'Université Laval – Louvain – Paris, Peeters, 2001. xix+842 p. 16 × 24

**Uppkong**, Justin S. et al., *Reading the Bible in the Global Village: Cape Town* (Global Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship 3). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. 221 p. 15 × 23. \$24,95

**van de Sandt**, Huub – **Flusser**, David, *The Didache*. Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum: Section III, Jewish Traditions in Early Christian Literature 5). Assen, Royal Van Gorcum – Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2002. xviii+431 p. 16 × 24. €63,00

**van Midden**, P.J. (ed.), *In de woestijn*. Numeri (Amsterdamse Cahiers voor exegese van de Bibel en zijn tradities 20). Maastricht, Uitgeverij Shaker Publishing, 2003. viii+155 p. 17 × 24,5. €67,50

**Van Seters**, John, *A Law Book for the Diaspora*. Revision in the Study of the Covenant Code. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002. xii+236 p. 16 × 24. £40,00

**Vance**, Donald R., *A Hebrew Reader for Ruth*. Peabody, Hendrickson Publishers, 2003. x+85 p. 18 × 23,5. \$12,95

**Vanhoeye**, Albert, *Dio ha tanto amato il mondo*. *Lectio* sul sacrificio di Cristo (Dalla Parola alla Vita 17). Milano, Paoline, 2003. 133 p. 12,5 × 20. €8,50

*Vetus latina*. *Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 26/2. *Apocalypsis Johannis*. 4. Lieferung: Apc 4,1–6,12. Hrsg. Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2002. pp. 241-320. 24 × 32

**Vines**, Michael E., *The Problem of Markan Genre*. The Gospel of Mark and the Jewish Novel (Academia Biblica 3). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. xi-220 p. 15 × 23. \$29.95

*Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinische Bibel*. 26/2. *Apocalypsis Johannis*. 7. Lieferung: Apc 13,1-16,2. Herausgegeben von Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2003. pp. 481-560. 24 × 32

*Vetus latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. 26/2. *Apocalypsis Johannis*. 6. Lieferung: Apc 9,19 – 13,1. Hrsg. Roger **Gryson**. Freiburg, Verlag Herder, 2002. pp. 401-480. 24 × 32

**Viagulamuthu**, Xavier Paul B., *Offering our Bodies as a Living Sacrifice to God*. A Study in Pauline Spirituality Based on Romans 12,2 (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Spiritualità 7). Roma, Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2002. 526 p. 17 × 24. €29,00 – \$30.00

**Vigini**, Guiliano, *Proverbi*. Con testo e note di commento a fronte (Bibbia Paoline 8). Milano, Paoline, 2002. 187 p. 13 × 19. €10,50

**Williams**, Demetrius K., *Enemies of the Cross of Christ*. The Terminology of the Cross and Conflict in Philippians (JSNTSS 223). London – New York, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002. xiv-278 p. 16 × 24. £55.00

**Werlitz**, Jürgen, *Die Bücher der Könige* (Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar, Altes Testament 8). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2002. 364 p. 13 × 20. €30,90 – SFr 52,50

**Wire**, Antoinette Clark, *Holy Lives, Holy Deaths*. A Close Hearing of Early Jewish Storytellers (Studies in Biblical Literature 1). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2002. x-420 p. 15 × 23. \$49.95

**Yon**, Marguerite – **Arnaud**, Daniel, *Études ougaritiques*. I. Travaux 1985-1995 (Ras Shamra-Ougarit 14). Paris, Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 2001. 422 p. 21 × 29.5. €63

**Zeller**, Dieter (Hg.), *Religion und Weltbild* (Marburger Religionsgeschichtliche Beiträge 2). Münster, LIT Verlag, 2002. 192 p. 16 × 23,5. €20,90

ISSN 0006-0887

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database, published by the American Theological Library Association, 250 S. Wacker Dr., 16th Flr., Chicago, IL 60606.  
E-mail: atla@atla.com. <http://www.atla.com/>

---

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

---

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa



Associato all'Unione Stampa Periodica Italiana

---

Finito di stampare il 28 aprile 2003

Tip.: Ist. Salesiano Pio XI - Via Umbertide, 11 - 00181 Roma